

# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXXII, No. 3

March, 1954



<b>Nineteenth Century American Catholic Magazines</b>	- - - - -	131
William L. Lucey		
<b>James Harrington and American Liberalism</b>		143
John J. Whealen		
<b>American Diplomats and the Kulturkampf</b>		153
Sister Joseph Damien Hanlon		
<b>A Peripatetic Review</b>	- - - - -	173
Thomas L. Coonan		
<b>Reviews of Books</b>	- - - - -	178
<b>Current Bibliography</b>	- - - - -	188

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PRESS

50 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a year

# The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

*A Service Quarterly for Teachers and Students of History*

Vol. XXXII

March, 1954

No. 3

## *Editor*

EDWARD R. VOLLMAR

## *Associate Editor*

LOWRIE J. DALY

## *Editorial Board*

John Francis Bannon

Thomas L. Coonan

Jasper W. Cross

Joseph P. Donnelly

Clarence L. Hohl

Laurence J. Kenny

Martin F. Hasting

Daniel D. McGarry

Edward J. Maguire

Thomas P. Neill

Paul G. Steinbicker

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri.

## INDEX OF BOOK REVIEWS

Everyday life in Anglo-Saxon, Viking and Norman Times .....	178
The Art of War in the Middle Ages .....	179
Struggle for Africa .....	179
The Rise and Decline of Liberalism .....	181
The Nature of Historical Explanation .....	182
What is History? .....	182
Christianity and the Problem of History .....	182
The Origin and Goal of History .....	182
The New England Mind .....	184
Bonanza Trail .....	185
Protestantism in America .....	186
Yankee Diplomacy: U. S. Intervention in Argentina .....	187
South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900 .....	187

# A REPORT ON NINETEENTH CENTURY AMERICAN CATHOLIC MAGAZINES

WILLIAM L. LUCEY\*  
HOLY CROSS COLLEGE

The historian working on the intellectual, cultural and social history of American Catholicism of the second half of the nineteenth century labors under a severe handicap. One of his major sources of information is seriously defective. The source is the Catholic magazines published from the years 1860 to 1900. The files of many are not available, if by good fortune they still exist, and the files of many more are incomplete. Without them the history of American Catholicism during this period can not be adequately written. And the discouraging feature of this situation is that this severe handicap may be permanent. It will be, unless an effort is made to rescue all extant issues of these old magazines from threat of destruction, place them in institutions where they can be catalogued and made available to future historians. The fear that it is too late to gather the complete files of some magazines is not unfounded.

Many, far too many, are unaware of how valuable Catholic magazines published during the years 1860-1900 are as a basic source of information of the intellectual and social growth of American Catholics. But any one doing research in this period knows their value and is discouraged to discover that many of them are unavailable for use. This writer has been working on the Catholic magazines published in English during these years with the hope of eventually preparing a guide of some sorts. Some progress can be reported, and much still remains to be done.<sup>1</sup> This paper is written to encourage all those in position to rescue old Catholic magazines from the danger of destruction to make the effort to do so. Future historians will be grateful for their efforts. Some salient features of Catholic journalism of the second half of the nineteenth century may indicate to them how important this task is.

I would like to give the reader unacquainted with Catholic journalism of the last century an impression of the large number

---

\* Father Lucey is professor of history at Holy Cross College.

<sup>1</sup> Present plans call for a series of articles on the magazines in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*. The first article: "Catholic Magazines: 1865-1880" appeared in the March, 1952 issue, pp. 21-36.



of Catholic magazines published during the years under consideration, of the rich variety of the publications, and of the unfortunate lack of complete files of many of the periodicals. From the first and second impressions, the reader will, I think, realize the value of the magazines as historical sources; from the third impression he will be saddened by the thought that these magazines are not available to the historian and will do what he can to rescue them from the danger of destruction.

## I

First, then, let us consider the numbers of magazines. The exact number originating during the years 1860-1900 cannot be given at this time, and so the publication figures for definite years and regions will be given as an index. The number of Catholic magazines originating in the nineteenth century still current today, then the number of magazines in circulation when the year 1890 began, and finally the growth of Catholic magazines in New England during 1885-1900 will be described. The reader should then have a fairly sound impression of the quantity of Catholic magazines.

One section of the Catholic Press Directory of 1951 is devoted to current magazines in English and in foreign languages. If one pages through the list of English magazines one will discover that *thirty-seven* of them originated before 1900. The Directory is not complete, since the *Woodstock Letters* (1872), *St. Anthony's Monthly* (1898), *Historical Records and Studies* (1899), and the *Annals of St. Anthony's Shrine* (1899), all four still currently published, have been omitted. I suspect others have also been omitted. At least *forty-one* American Catholic English magazines of the nineteenth century still survive, and when one considers the high mortality rate of magazines this is an imposing number.<sup>2</sup> Many of these survivors are the best known Catholic magazines today.<sup>3</sup> Each would give the historian, if their files were complete and available, a continuous source of information on an important facet of Catholic activity.

<sup>2</sup> In this paper we are not concerned with Catholic weekly news journals. Some of the magazines were published weekly, but usually the title, format, and contents suffice to distinguish the magazine from the news journal. However, in a few instances the reader may disagree with my judgment.

<sup>3</sup> The *Ave Maria*, *Catholic World*, *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, *American Ecclesiastical Review*, *Records of the ACHS of Phila.*, *The Rosary*, *St. Anthony Messenger*. If we except the *Catholic Directory* which has been published continuously since 1833, the oldest magazine is the *Annals of the Holy Childhood* (1860).

Had there been a Catholic press directory for the year 1890, at least *sixty-one* English magazines would have been listed and described. There were at least *sixty-one* as the year started, and publications by college students, the many Catholic magazines in foreign languages and some annuals are not included in this estimate. Many magazines had started and had ceased publication before 1890, and, of course, some of the magazines current in 1890 did not survive the decade; nevertheless, here are sixty-one sources which, taken together, illumine nearly every phase of American Catholic intellectual, cultural, religious and social life, provided their files have survived to our day and are available. And I think the historian can figure on more than eighty Catholic magazines origin—during the 1890's, with the same proviso added. It is true that many of the magazines that started in the 1890's did not survive the decade, but even though some had a very brief existence each had some unique information about American Catholic life. The reader, I think, can gather from the number of Catholic magazines published in 1890, from the number originating during the 1890's, and from the number of nineteenth century magazines that have survived until now, how valuable the Catholic magazines are as a source for the history of American Catholicism.

The reader may be able to appreciate better the remarkable growth of Catholic magazines late in the nineteenth century by considering the increase in one definite region. New England is taken as the region because the number of magazines in these States is fairly well known.<sup>4</sup>

In 1885 there were in all New England three Catholic news weeklies and four magazines. The weekly journals were the *Boston Pilot*, founded in 1837 and long before 1885 a tradition in Catholic journalism, *The Weekly Visitor* (later *The Providence Visitor*) established by Bishop Thomas F. Hendicken of Providence, Rhode Island, in 1873, and the *Connecticut Catholic* of Hartford, originating in 1876. Among the four magazines were a monthly organ of the Hibernians called the *Hibernian Record*, founded in 1878 and published in New Haven and a literary monthly *Donahoe's Magazine*, started by Patrick Donahoe of the *Boston Pilot* in 1879. For years this monthly was the most popular of Catholic magazines with its circulation as high

<sup>4</sup> See the author's article: "Spring-Tide of Catholic Journalism in New England: 1885-1900," in *Holy Cross Alumnus* (February, 1952), 9-13.



as 42,275 in 1895. The other two magazines were philanthropic and both were published in Boston: *The Working Boy*, a monthly, originated in 1883 and was published by the Xaverian Brothers in the interests of homeless boys, and *The Orphan's Friend*, a quarterly, started in 1884 by the Brothers of Charity in the interests of the House of the Angel Guardian. It is a tribute to these hardy pioneers that two of the weeklies and two of the magazines are still in circulation. One could offer some sort of an argument that *Donahoe's* is still with us, for in 1908 this magazine sold out to the *Catholic World*.

During the next fifteen years eleven more weekly journals entered the field of Catholic journalism. Four of these weeklies were in Massachusetts, three in Connecticut, three in New Hampshire, and one in Maine.<sup>5</sup>

New England Catholics were not satisfied with weekly journals, and one can gather how anxious they were to exploit the advantages of the press from the many magazines that were planned and published. Besides the eleven weekly journals, seventeen magazines appeared during these fifteen years.<sup>6</sup>

Probably the most important contribution of New England journalism of this period was the parish magazine. Six originated during these years and all of them were in Boston archdiocese; one of the six, *The Sacred Heart Review* (1888-1918), quickly developed into the best national magazine of Catholic opinion and some of the others had long and respectable careers.<sup>7</sup> Among the remaining magazines (all but two originated in Massachusetts), one finds educational, devotional, philanthropic, temperance and

---

<sup>5</sup> The Massachusetts weeklies were: *The Messenger* (Worcester: 1887), *The Springfield Tribune* (1888), *The Catholic Advocate* (Fall River: 1888), *The Catholic Union* (1891). The Connecticut weeklies were: *The Catholic Standard* (New Haven: 1889), *The Village Catholic* (Waterbury: 1891), *Catholic Transcript* (Hartford: 1898). The three New Hampshire weeklies were published in Manchester: *The New Hampshire Catholic* (1886), *Standard* (1893), *Emerald* (1894). *The Columbian* (1896?) was published in Portland, Maine.

<sup>6</sup> It is not always easy to distinguish the weekly magazine from the weekly news journal, and so some may dispute the title of magazine given to some of the seventeen.

<sup>7</sup> The other parish magazines were: *Marlboro Star* (1887-1893), a semi-monthly; *Catholic Citizen* (1888-1937), a weekly in Chelsea; *Sunday Register* (1892-1913), a Lawrence weekly; *Index* (1895-1907), a monthly published in Haverhill; *Quincy Monitor* (1886-1898) a monthly.

family publications.<sup>8</sup> With the exception of *The Sacred Heart Review*, they were not periodicals of great merit, and only a few of them have survived, but they were all witnesses of the fact that Catholics appreciated the power of the press and they all are sources (if fortunately still extant) of American Catholic Life at the end of the nineteenth century.

I would like to conclude this effort to give the reader some idea of the number of Catholic magazines published during the years 1860-1900 with a reference to a contemporary appraisal. Dr. Theodore L. Flood, editor of *The Chautauquan*, ran a series of articles on religious journalism during the years 1894-1895. The articles on Catholic journalism, the third in the series, was written by Father James J. Dunn, and he reviewed the work of Catholics in this field from Bishop England's *Catholic Miscellany* to the year 1895, naming the best editors, the outstanding journals, and the better magazines.<sup>9</sup> He ended by saying that there were 215 Catholic serials in the United States at the time of his writing; he was counting news journals and magazines of all types and languages in this figure. There were, he said, *thirty-six* English monthlies, including seventeen college magazines, and six quarterlies.

Dr. Flood was so impressed by this article that he made it the topic of his lead editorial in the same issue of his magazine, and I think one will better appreciate the strength of Catholic journalism in the 1890's by reading his comments on Father Dunn's statements.

First, he stated, the number of Catholic periodicals ably refute the charge that Catholics are ignorant and that the hierarchy

---

<sup>8</sup> The other magazines were: *The Bouquet for Catholic Families* (1891), a weekly that later merged with *Orphan's Friends* *The Catholic School and Home Magazine* (1892-1897), a monthly published in Worcester by the Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, later Rector of Catholic University and Bishop of Los Angeles; *Springfield C.T.A. Union Herald* (1892-?), *Patriotic Catholic America* (1894-), a monthly in Boston; *The Columbiad* (1893-21), a K of C monthly of Boston that developed into the current *Columbia*; *Father Matthew Herald* (1894-1914?), a monthly in Boston; *Celtic Mirror* (1895-?), a monthly published in Augusta, Maine; *Guidon* (1898-1907), a monthly published in Concord, New Hampshire; *Hibernian* (1899-1918), a semi-monthly in Boston; *Annals of St. Anthony's Shrine* (1899c), an annual published in Worcester; *Alumni Sodality Bulletin* (1899c), a monthly of Boston.

<sup>9</sup> XX (March, 1895), 712-720. Flood's editorial comments on this article are on pp. 728-729.



wants to keep them in darkness. There is not, he added:

A Protestant Church in the United States but may covet the gifts of enterprise and the spirit of progress which characterize the management of journalism in this great body of people.

He quoted the circulation figures of a few weeklies, and remarked that:

These remarkable achievements in journalism are not paralleled by any periodical as to price and circulation in any branch of the Protestant Church.

He thought of the magazines that Father Dunn had mentioned and confessed:

One's interest is heightened in current Catholic literature in reading of the large number of Catholic monthlies, bi-monthlies, and quarterlies mentioned in Father Dunn's essay.

He concluded by observing that "the press of the Catholic Church is powerful, aggressive, and numerically strong," and he recommended Protestants to imitate the Catholics by publishing periodicals at a lower price that would increase the opportunities of educating the poor in religion.

Dr. Flood would have been more impressed if the exact figures of Catholic periodicals were available to Father Dunn. Exact figures were difficult to get then and they are now. But we do know that there were many more than nineteen English monthlies (excluding the college publications) and six quarterlies. How many more we do not care to say now, but the reader can reach a safe estimate by the figures given for magazines current in 1890 and those originating in the 1890's.

## II

Quantity was not the only salient feature of Catholic journalism in the nineteenth century. There was also diversity, and for the historian diversity of sources is as important as abundance. To get an idea of the types of Catholic magazines published during these years and accordingly an understanding of the many facets of Catholic life made known by them, let us examine the sixty-one magazines known to be in circulation as the year 1890 began. Some of them can be easily classified while others were not cut for any category, but we shall do the best we can. The results will point to a healthy variety of Catholic magazines: literary, historical, family, devotional, juvenile, parish, missionary and philanthropic, temperance, educational, publisher's trade journals, fraternal and benevolent.



There were seven literary or learned magazines. Two of them, the reader will note, are important in the field today, one other was published for nearly fifty years and long had the reputation here and abroad of being an outstanding quarterly, while another, *Donahoe's*, merged after thirty years with *The Catholic World*. The seven were: *Month* (1864-?), *The Catholic World* (1865c) *American Catholic Quarterly Review* (1876-1924), *The American Ecclesiastical Review* (1889c), *Donahoe's Magazine* (1878-1908), and the *Globe* (1889-1904); For want of an accurate class to describe the *Illustrated Catholic Weekly* (1880-1896) of New York, we shall append it to the literary group. Maurice Francis Egan was once associated with its editorial office and so, by association, it was literary. It did not pretend to be learned.

There were five historical journals: *The Woodstock Letters* (1872c), *Griffin's Journal* (1873-1900), *American Historical Researches* (1884-1912), *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* (1887c), and the *United States Historical Magazine* (1887-1892). All were devoted to the gathering of records of Catholic Americana and all gave testimony that at last Catholics were becoming conscious of their heritage. The first magazine was privately published by the Society of Jesus as a record of their members and institutions in the Americas. Martin F. X. Griffin of Philadelphia published the next two journals and was closely associated with the fourth. John Gilmary Shea was editor and main prop of the fifth, a quarterly published in New York.

The *Ave Maria* (1865c), a weekly, and the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (1866c), a monthly, were more than devotional magazines although both were very much interested in the promotion of a devotion. They may be accurately described as family magazines, for they also provided Catholic families with light and serious reading, editorial opinions on current events, and comments on the literature of the day. These two were pioneers in this type of publication, the family magazine, and their circulation proved that this type appealed to the Catholics.

The strictly devotional magazine was popular, too. We would list eight as qualifying for this type: *Annals of the Holy Childhood* (1860c), *Annals of Our Lady of the Angels* (1874-1911?), *The Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart* (1877-98?), *Pilgrim of Our Lady of Martyrs* (1884-1926), *Annals of Our Lady of Lourdes* (1885c), *Crusader's Almanac* (1886c), *Poor Soul's Advocate* (1888-1895), *The Annals of St. Joseph* (1888c). Since four of the eight are still current one may safely assume that the

publishers of these journals were rather successful in promoting Catholic devotions.

The next group of magazines were those publications motivated by Christian love for the poor and unfortunates and by zeal to spread the faith. Philanthropic is an inadequate description; Christian social service would be more adequate for some of them and home missionary for others, for they were published to arouse interest and financial support in the care and Christian education of the orphans, unfortunates, negroes and Indians. There were eight publications of this class: *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* (1838-1923), *The Indian Sentinel* (1874c), *The Sacred Heart Unions* (1878c), *The Working Boy* (1883c), *The Orphan's Friend* (1884c), *The Colored Harvest* (1886c), *The Homeless Boy* (1877-?), and *Annals of the Association of Our Lady of Victory* (1888-1929). The remarkable feature of these six periodicals is their endurance; all but three are still promoting their Christian charity. Few types of magazines can equal that record.

The parish magazine has already been mentioned in the section on New England. There were, no doubt, other parish periodicals in other dioceses, but the only ones known to be in circulation in 1890 were all in the Boston archdiocese. There were four: *The Quincy Monitor* (1886-1898), *Marlboro Star* (1887-1893), *Catholic Citizen* (Chelsea: 1888-1937), and *The Sacred Heart Review* (Cambridge: 1888-1918). The latter did not long remain a parish weekly, for, as we have noted, it soon became a national magazine of outstanding merit and had by 1894 the astounding circulation of 40,000. A glance at the years of origin of these four journals will show that an enthusiasm for journalism was spreading throughout the archdiocese in the late 1880's.

The number of Catholic juvenile publications will be, I think, a pleasant surprise to many readers. As the last decade of the nineteenth century got under way there were ten magazines for the young and one of the ten is still a current publication. There were other juveniles published prior to 1890, but they had not survived;<sup>10</sup> but at least four of the ten here mentioned had long

---

<sup>10</sup> The seventies was a poor decade for juveniles; only one has been discovered. But the sixties and eighties were greatly concerned with literature for the young. There were five juveniles originating in the sixties, but they had all suspended publications by 1890.



and useful lives introducing young American Catholics to good and wholesome reading. The ten were: *The Guardian Angel* (Philadelphia: 1867-1909), *Sunday School Companion* (Chicago: 1869-1904), *Young Catholic* (New York: 1870-1905), *Chimes* (Baltimore: 1880-?), *Catholic Youth* (Brooklyn: 1881-?), *Little Crusader* (Columbus, Ohio: 1882-?), *Angelus* (Detroit: 1884-?), *Young Catholic Messenger* (Dayton, Ohio: 1885c), *Le Conteulx Leader* (Buffalo: 1886-1949), *Young Folks' Catholic Weekly* (Philadelphia: 1889-?). From these sources the historians learn much about the reading habits of the youth and compare the tastes of the youth in various regions.

In the post-Civil War years American Catholics, encouraged by the hierarchy, began to establish and to join benevolent and fraternal societies that would provide members with some social life as well as material help in the form of insurance. Among the first and more successful of these societies were Catholic Knights of America (1877), Catholic Knights of St. George (1881), Catholic Benevolent Legion (1881), and Knights of St. John (1886). These societies soon had their national and state organs that were, of course, primarily concerned with the affairs of their organizations. There were in 1890 nine such organs of Catholic fraternal societies, and although their contents are severely restricted they do contain the records of the social and economic life of American Catholics.

Among the remaining magazines we find an educational periodical, *Our Parochial Schools* (1887-?), a semi-monthly published in Phlox, Wisconsin, two temperance weeklies, *The Index* (1887-?), published in Scranton, and the *C.T.A. News* (1887-?) of Philadelphia, and two book trade journals, *The Tablet* (1889-1906), a quarterly published by John Murphy and Company of Baltimore, and Benziger's *Catholic Book News* (1847c).

Two magazines do not lend themselves easily to a classification; they were published in the interests of Ireland and Irish literature as well as of the Catholic faith. Whatever class they are assigned, the two magazines were *The Gael* (1881-1904) of Boston and *The Irish Echo* (1886-1894) of Brooklyn.

The last publication is in a class by itself and is the most valuable of all to the historian: *The Catholic Directory* which had been published continuously, sometimes in quarterly numbers, since 1833.

## III

We now come to the last lesson of this paper. It is obvious that the Catholic magazines of the years 1860-1900 are an invaluable source for the history of American Catholicism. They are numerous and diverse. Whether any or many qualify as great religious literature is beside the point; all the better for the historian and American Catholicism if some of the magazines were in fact outstanding. Actually many contemporary Catholics considered American Catholic journalism of mediocre calibre. But the magazines must be taken for what they were, praised or censured as they deserve. Evaluation of their literary value is not the task of this paper. Whether they were excellent or mediocre, the fact remains that they are invaluable sources of American Catholic religious, intellectual, cultural and social life of American Catholics in the second half of the nineteenth century, and without them the historian will be unable to write a comprehensive history of American Catholicism of this period. Are these nineteenth century magazines available to the historian?

The answer will be found by consulting the *Union List of Serials*, for the historian depends on this reference to tell him what magazines are available for research and where the files of these magazines are. Files of magazines not listed in this work may exist, but unless the historian knows what and where, they are of little use to him. Let us, then, make a test. How many of the 1890 Catholic magazines are in the *Union List*, and how many complete files are available?

Complete files of the literary and learned magazines have been well preserved, and the historian will have no difficulty in consulting them. He will no doubt have to travel, but that it is not considered a great obstacle to an historian. There are seven magazines in this class and all of them will be found in the *Union List*. With the exception of one, the complete files of all are available. The exception is the *Illustrated Catholic American*; its files are incomplete, although the reader should remember that the files of this and other magazines hereafter listed as unavailable or incomplete might be held by some library not reporting to the *Union List*.

The historical journals have also fared well. *The Woodstock Letters* will not be found in the *Union List*, probably because it is privately circulated, but most libraries of the older Jesuit insti-



tutions have complete files of this quarterly. The other five journals are listed, and the complete files of all but one are available. The exception is *Griffin's Journal*, and the hope that more than one complete file of this magazine are in non-reporting libraries is not entirely baseless.

A favorable report can be made on the two magazines classified as family: *Ave Maria* and *The Messenger*. Indeed, the situation would be hopeless if a favorable report could not be made on two of the oldest and most valuable of the Catholic periodicals. Both are in the *Union List*, and complete files are listed.

The same encouraging report can not be made for the rest of the magazines. Of the eight devotional publications only five will be found in the *Union List* and only one can claim a complete file: *Poor Souls' Advocate*. In the case of two magazines the holdings, as given by reporting libraries, are very poor or scattering. The record in this class of magazines is then: one known complete file; four incomplete; three unknown. A historian is discouraged from working on the devotional periodical literature of the years 1860-1900 from the start; he knows that very little is available to him.

The situation is the same with those magazines described as organs of Christian social service and home missions. There are eight in this group. Five will be found in the *Union List*; three will not. *The Indian Sentinel* is the only magazine listed with a complete file; the holdings of three others are meagre. Again, this is discouraging information for the historian.

Only one of the four parish magazines will be found in the *Union List*: *The Sacred Heart Review*, and fortunately a complete file of this very important weekly is available. However, there may be some hope for the other parish periodicals, for they are really local religious publications and the editor of the *Union List* could not find space in this reference work for that class of publications. The preservation of juvenile magazines has been, judging by the norm here used, very careless. Only two of them are in the *Union List*, and the holdings of these two are extremely meagre.

No report can be given on the next group, the organs of Catholic benevolent and fraternal societies. The *Union List* could find no space for organs of fraternal societies. We can only hope that the archives of these Catholic organizations have not been neglected.

From the last group of magazines, the educational and the two temperance journals are not in the *Union List*, while the two publishers' trade journals and the two magazines devoted to Celtic literature and affairs are listed there. However, of these four magazines the complete file of only one (*Irish Echo*) is available. One complete file out of seven magazines is a disturbing proportion.

It is obvious from this survey of Catholic magazines that a basic source of the history of American Catholicism in the second half of the nineteenth century is deplorably weak. In taking the magazines of 1890 as a test case I do not think that an unfair picture of the current availability of nineteenth century Catholic magazines has been given. From my acquaintance with those magazines that suspended publication before 1890 and those that originated in the 1890's, it is safe to say that about the same proportion are not in the *Union List* and about the same proportion of incomplete sets will also be found.

Does this mean that complete files of these magazines do not exist and that the plight of the historian is permanent? Only a pessimist would draw that conclusion. Undoubtedly there are libraries not reporting to the editor of the *Union List* with good holdings in Catholic magazines. Undoubtedly, too, the files, complete or incomplete, of many Catholic magazines of this period are hidden away in garrets and studies of private homes and Catholic institutions. But they are of little help to the historian unless he knows where they are and until they are made available to him. And there is always the danger that the files of these magazines hidden away in garrets will be permanently destroyed. We know that many have in the past been destroyed. The danger of others suffering the same fate remains and will remain until they are rescued from their hiding places and gathered in libraries where they will be preserved and made accessible to the historian.

Before the Catholic magazines of the nineteenth century can be exploited by the historians as they should be, two urgent tasks remain to be done. First, an extensive drive to persuade persons possessing issues of these magazines to save them and donate them to any library that promises to catalogue and preserve them. Secondly, a union list of Catholic magazines of all types in libraries must be published so that the historian knows what magazines are available and where they are.



# JAMES HARRINGTON AND AMERICAN LIBERALISM, 1789-1800

JOHN J. WHEALEN\*  
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

If recent American historiography as regards the influence of European political theorists on the formative years of this country has shown nothing else, it has certainly proved beyond reasonable doubt that no one of them has the field to himself but that, on the contrary, American liberal political theory is just that—distinctively American.

In the light of this, it would be foolhardy indeed to bring forth in this paper the name of James Harrington as one who had a direct or dominating influence on that unique and yet elusive thing we have come to call the American liberal tradition. And, as a matter of fact, that is not the primary purpose of this paper for the simple reason that this job has been done and done well by others, notably H. F. Russell-Smith.<sup>1</sup>

Rather the object of this paper is to suggest that the central theme of Harrington, and the one for which he is famous—power follows wealth—was the overall controlling assumption used by the Jeffersonian Republicans in the period 1789-1800 with which they could put into cogent form their theory of the nature and purpose of the state derived from various and sometimes contradictory sources.

That early American liberal theory had need of such a controlling assumption or formula enabling it to fit these various theories into a system that reconciled all the contradictory elements is obvious to any serious student of political thought in this country. While there are many instances that could be cited, probably the greatest and most all-embracing of these contradictions inherent in the liberals theory as a result of the various sources from which they drew, turns upon the question of individualism versus social welfare. Indeed the history of liberal political thought in this country reveals that from its very inception the liberal in America has been plagued with a schizophrenic nature, constantly battling within himself to give free rein to

---

\* Mr. Whealen is a member of the Department of History of Saint Louis University.

<sup>1</sup> H. F. Russell-Smith, *Harrington and His Oceana* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914) chaps. vii, viii; see also T. W. Dwight, "Harrington and His Influence Upon American Political Institutions and Political Thought", *Political Science Quarterly*, II (1887).

one or the other of these tendencies. Even today, the confusion over the term "liberal" itself, with both of our great parties vying for the honorific title is indicative of this struggle.

Thus when one of Jefferson's most recent interpreters concludes that, "his [Jefferson's] most characteristic position was nearer to social utilitarianism than it was to the individualism with which his name is associated,"<sup>2</sup> we are not only made aware concretely of the opposing viewpoints existing in this patron saint of liberal thought, but realize that the Lockean atomistic theories of Jefferson (which no one denies were present) must have been tempered by some other theory, some other formula which balanced the individualism in his thought (but did not destroy it) and withal made his system understandable to his generation.

Professor Chinard has done much to resolve this apparent contradiction in Jefferson's thought by showing that Jefferson had a philosophical basis for his position in that he had developed a series of natural rights peculiar to himself and to his country which distinguished between natural and civil rights.<sup>3</sup> Thus though Jefferson was, as are all men, a product of his age in that he spoke of the compact theory of government, he by no means held property (as did Locke) to be an absolute prepolitical right, the securing of which was the sole reason for men entering into civil society.

On the contrary, Jefferson's natural rights are those which man can retain without the help of the state, such as freedom of thought, religion, etc. And this is a crucial division; for it has been historically the belief in property as a prepolitical absolute right that has both in England and America given rise to untrammelled individualism. Chinard would no doubt agree with Wiltse that Jefferson's system of rights boils down to the idea that man in society has no rights in opposition to his duties.<sup>4</sup>

That Jefferson could come up with such an idea of rights is not surprising when we consider that the secularized and modernized natural law of which Hobbes and Locke are outstanding examples never caught on in America as it did in Europe. On the

---

<sup>2</sup> C. M. Wiltse, *The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935) 177.

<sup>3</sup> Gilbert Chinard, *Thomas Jefferson, Apostle of Americanism* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1929) 79-85, 233.

<sup>4</sup> Wiltse, *op. cit.*, 176.



contrary, we know that the American's interpretation of the law of nature was more in the Aristotelian theme of man as a social animal, a theory which scholastic hangings-on and Puritan theology did more to buttress than destroy;<sup>5</sup> that is why James Otis could as late as 1764 affirm without apparent fear of contradiction that government was founded not on a compact theory, but from the very "necessities of our natures."<sup>6</sup>

Yet standing alone, such a system lacked one vital ingredient, one formula that would keep it tied to reality and thus secure from straying to the extremes of either individualism or paternalism. This, the writer would suggest, is the role played by the central thesis of Harrington. But to see this it will be necessary to do two things. First, we must examine a little more closely that thesis itself, and secondly, we must show why and how it proved so attractive to the thirteen colonies and the first of our great liberal parties, the Jeffersonian Republicans.

James Harrington (1611-77) republican political theorist is most famous for writing the "utopian" work, *The Commonwealth of Oceana*.<sup>7</sup> Written in the midst of the Civil Wars in England and completed in 1656, the *Oceana* reveals that Harrington, more than any of his contemporaries grasped the economic basis of the struggle and of the political system which he hoped would emerge from it, republicanism. The core of Harrington's thought can be summed up in the dictum that "power follows wealth"; therefore the form of government will be determined by the degree to which wealth (and in his day, this meant land) is distributed. In the hands of one person, wealth would determine a monarchy; in the hands of a few, an aristocracy; in the hands of many, a republic.<sup>8</sup>

The Civil Wars, then, are interpreted as a group of the landed gentry fighting for the power that should have been theirs for some time, namely since they had become wealthy with the distribution of land during the successive reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. The revolution is thus an attempt to bring a group

<sup>5</sup> See, for instance Benjamin F. Wright, *American Interpretations of Natural Law* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931); Ray Forrest Harvey, *Jean Jacques Burlamaqui* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937).

<sup>6</sup> Wright, *op. cit.*, 68.

<sup>7</sup> James Harrington, *The Oceana and Other Works of James Harrington*, ed. John Toland (London: 1747).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 39, 40.

to the position of political power which the cunning Tudors, by dint of political sagacity had forestalled. The Civil Wars were inevitable, sooner or later, for the simple reason that power had not followed wealth as it would ordinarily do.

Since, however, Harrington is enamoured of the republican form of government and since he realized that the form of government is determined by the way in which wealth is distributed, he is at pains to point out that the best way to achieve and maintain the republican form would be to keep land and thus wealth widely distributed. Hence his advice that no person should own land having an annual income exceeding £2000.<sup>9</sup>

For the colonists in America, such a theory as this was no mere theory; it squared with what they had seen in practice. For if the colonies on the eve of Revolution were distinguished on any counts surely the two that were most outstanding were the amazing spirit of self-government they evidenced through their increasingly powerful colonial assemblies and the abundance of land available to the settler.

It does not, it has not taken anyone of extraordinary perception to see that the former was a product of the latter. To be sure, the English colonies had a strong tradition of political independence and self-government in the past of their mother country, not the least of which was the recent and Glorious Revolution of 1688; then, too, their prowess at self-government had been augmented by a half-hearted mercantilistic policy which made "salutary neglect" the mother of colonial assemblies.

But the plain fact of the matter is that, despite all this, it was primarily the abundance and wide distribution of land that gave the colonists the impetus toward self-government. Time and again, colonies had been founded along the Atlantic seaboard with the express intention of setting up the trappings of a feudal economy like that which held or had held sway in overcrowded and tradition-bound Europe. The institutions of quitrent, the patroon system, and for that matter the mere existence of the proprietary colonies so significantly prevalent under the Stuarts are examples. But in a country where land was open to the settler for the taking and where, for the most part, it was impossible to prevent him from locating anywhere he wished,<sup>10</sup> the idea of

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>10</sup> Carl Becker, *U. S.: Experiment in Democracy* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1920) 148-151.



a transplanted Europe, a sort of neo-feudal age, quickly became passe, and the dictum that power follows wealth was soon proved by the defiant voices of a new landed gentry ringing through the halls of newly established colonial assemblies.

Not content, however, with the mere access of land owned in fee simple, many of the colonies went one step further. By 1770 almost all of them had abolished the English laws of primogeniture and entail with a view to curbing the growth of large estates.<sup>11</sup> Only in New York and Virginia was the custom, which Harrington had, incidentally, condemned, retained.

For the colonists, the lesson was obvious. Representative government had grown up not through some mythical contract which had been agreed to at the end of some even more mythical state of nature; representative government was a fact because most of the wealth (land) and hence most of the power that inevitably follows upon the acquisition of the former was widely distributed. Is it any wonder, then, that the colonists read Harrington often and with respect and that James Otis could call him "incomparable"?<sup>12</sup>

Yet with the coming of the war for independence, it was not to Harrington but to Locke that the colonists turned for justification. For not only was Locke the popular exponent of Revolution, but his emphasis of the sanctity of property rights suited exactly the needs of the leaders of both pre-revolutionary and immediate post-revolutionary eras.<sup>13</sup>

Once the terrors of the "critical period" had passed with the ratification of the Constitution, the ideas of James Harrington were resurrected and it is here that his central theme is most indelibly impressed upon the story of liberal thought in America. For once the country had begun to function as a nation in 1789, the job of the liberal became not the establishing but the preserving of the republican form of government. It is for this reason that the theories of Harrington could be invoked now more than ever; for if it had been along the lines of Harrington's wide distribution of property thesis that republican government had been born, what was more simple than to see that it was pre-

---

<sup>11</sup> J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement* (Princeton: University Press, 1926) 40-72.

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization* (2 vols.; New York: Viking Press, 1946) I, 116.

<sup>13</sup> This point is explained very well in Paschal Larkin, *Property in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd., 1930) chap. v.

served by the same process, a maintenance and even extension of that distribution?<sup>14</sup>

And this in fact became the main core and end of our first great liberal party, the Jeffersonian Republicans. For while much has been written which would attempt to identify the basic tenets of the party along the lines of states' rights, small government, and above all laissez faire tendencies, it is notable that each of these were in turn sacrificed at one time or another to put across the one idea which gave the party its mission in life, a fight against concentrated wealth, landed or monied.

Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in the thought and actions of the leader of the movement itself, Thomas Jefferson. Whether Jefferson read Harrington or not is a moot point. On the debit side, Jefferson seems never to have mentioned him and Chinard seems to have proved beyond reasonable doubt that Jefferson's views on primogeniture were influenced by others.<sup>15</sup> Yet Jefferson's copy of Harrington's work is at this moment in the Library of Congress, and it seems inconceivable that he would not have read the man, as well versed as he was in seventeenth century republican writers.

In any case, whether or not Jefferson actually read Harrington, his actions from the Declaration of Independence to his accession to the presidency in 1800 show a striking similarity and end purpose to this central theme of Harrington. As early as the draft of the Virginia constitution, Jefferson was fighting bigness in wealth. It was he for instance, who fought for the abolishment of primogeniture and entail and it was he who was responsible for the insertion of the following significant article:

Every person of full age neither owning nor having owned fifty acres of land, shall be entitled to an appropriation of fifty acres or to so much as shall make up what he owns or has owned fifty acres in full and absolute domain. And no other person shall be capable of taking an appropriation.<sup>16</sup>

Nor was Jefferson apparently concerned about his so-called laissez-faire theory of government when it came to this primary

---

<sup>14</sup> It is interesting to note that this was John Adams' interpretation of the origins of the revolution, a fact which is not without significance when we know that he was an avid reader of Harrington. See Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (3 vols.; New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927-30) I, 319-20.

<sup>15</sup> Chinard, *op. cit.*, 30.

<sup>16</sup> Cited in Wiltse, *op. cit.*, 137.



end of abolishing great concentrations of wealth. As he said in 1785:

I am conscious that an equal division of property is impracticable, but the consequences of this enormous inequality producing so much misery to the bulk of mankind, legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property, only taking care to let their subdivisions go hand in hand with the natural affections of the human mind. The descent of property of every kind, therefore, to all the children or to all the brothers and sisters or other relatives in equal degree is a politic measure and a practicable one. Another means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation below a certain point, and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression as they rise. Whenever there are in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right . . . The small landholders are the most precious part of the state.<sup>17</sup>

The extreme commonsense approach to the problem of inequalities of wealth as shown in this quotation would alone do much to remove any lingering charges that Jefferson was doctrinaire in an extreme rationalistic sense. But, more to the point, it reveals exactly how Jefferson in a concrete instance would apply the peculiar set of rights which he had developed to the delicate question of property. How far he is from the Lockean concept of property as a prepolitical absolute right is seen by the fact that, for him, it would not be the confiscation of property that would violate natural law, but the holding of more than one can himself use while others are in need! And while his statement that the small landholder is the "most precious" part of society would seem merely to confirm his physiocratic tendencies, we now know that Jefferson's predilection for the small landholders antedates any physiocratic influence in this country.<sup>18</sup>

Yet if it wasn't exclusively physiocratic leanings that made Jefferson plump for the small farmer, what was it? The writer would submit that (consciously or not) it was the Harringtonian controlling assumption that if wealth is conveniently distributed by dividing land and keeping it divided, power will be likewise diffused; and republican government will survive.

<sup>17</sup> Adrienne Koch and William Reden, eds., *The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Modern Library Edition, New York: Random House, 1944) 388-9.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Hofstadter, "Parrington and the Jeffersonian Tradition", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, II (1941), 391-400.

And as Joseph Dorfman has pointed out, this is why Jefferson, unlike many of his contemporaries, did not fear the coming of democracy; for it was a democracy of small, independent property-holders that he envisioned would make up the citizenry.<sup>19</sup> It has been the task of later liberals to follow this Jeffersonian example of economic hardheadedness and, once the "safety valve" had been exhausted, devise new ways of avoiding concentrations of wealth that would make the Marxian prediction of the widening breach between capitalists and proletariat come true. In this sense, it is more than playing with words to say that liberals are conservative.

When we come to consider the writings of John Taylor of Caroline, a man on whom Jefferson time and again put his stamp of approval, this central idea is even more explicitly stated, and this time there seems to be little doubt that Taylor took it directly from Harrington. For although Taylor was strangely insistent upon refusing to credit the source of his political ideas, it is definitely known that he read Harrington; and even if this were not so, the content of many of his statements would reveal it. Moreover when we realize that he was impatient with most political theorists for not taking into account the economic basis of republicanism (the very thing for which Harrington was famous) our certainty that Taylor was influenced by him becomes almost metaphysical.<sup>20</sup>

Like Jefferson and Harrington, Taylor was an agrarian; but his leanings toward that group is more pronounced precisely because he, unlike the former had a greater insight into the ease of concentration of wealth a capitalistic system could offer. He spent his life attacking the methods of Hamiltonian finance precisely because of this. As he said:

Wealth, like suffrage, must be considerably distributed to sustain a democrattick republic; and hence, whatever draws a considerably proportion of either into a few hands, will destroy it. As *power follows wealth*, the majority must have wealth or lose power.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Dorfman, *op. cit.*, I, 445.

<sup>20</sup> Eugene Tenbrook Mudge, *The Social Philosophy of John Taylor of Caroline* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939) 8-9.

<sup>21</sup> John Taylor, *An Inquiry Into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States* (Fredericksburg, Va.: Green & Cady, 1814) 274; also quoted in Mudge, *op. cit.*, 166.



And more to the point:

If wealth is accumulated into the hands of a few either by a feudal or a stock monopoly, it carries the power also; and a government becomes as certainly aristocratical by a monopoly of wealth as by a monopoly of arms. A minority, obtaining a majority of wealth of arms in any mode, becomes the government.<sup>22</sup>

Nor were these ideas as regards property confined to the more articulate members of the growing party. As Professor Link has shown, substantially the same views permeated the ranks of the Democratic-Republican societies which had sprung up in the years 1790-1800 in opposition to the Federalists.<sup>23</sup>

It was not, then, any opposition to private property that constituted the core of our first great liberal party. On the contrary they took a leaf out of the Federalists' notebook to insist that it was necessary. But the distribution of it was the key. A concentration they felt would lead to monarchy; a distribution to democracy.

Hence John Locke with his sanctity of property doctrine became the philosopher of the conservatives (in England, the economic liberals) while the thesis of Harrington became the property of the liberals who insisted that while republican government could not indeed exist without private property, it was equally true that it could not long be preserved if that private property was concentrated into the hands of the few. In short the doctrine that made America was used to save America, an interesting point to remember the next time a discussion of what is "truly American" arises.

Yet for the liberal, the battle to implement that doctrine has been uphill all the way for the simple reason that the conservatives "got there fustest with the mostest". For not only was the Lockean sanctity-of-property idea stamped indelibly upon the consciousness of America as a result of the critical period, it was nourished quite ably through the nineteenth century, finally reaching its apex in the Fourteenth Amendment which, if not passed specifically for that purpose, at least was used to compel even the states to forfeit their only weapon against it, the police power.

---

<sup>22</sup> Quoted in Mudge, *op. cit.*, 166.

<sup>23</sup> Eugene Perry Link, *Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790-1800*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), 119.

Many historians would argue that it took precisely that long for the liberals to realize that political democracy had no meaning without economic democracy.<sup>24</sup> On the contrary, this writer would say, and hopes this paper has proved, that our first great liberals not only saw that in their own time, but saw it to such an extent that they didn't even bother to make the distinction; that, in fact, they held that democracy must be precisely and inseparably both economic and political since its political blessings are only permanently possible if accompanied by the material conditions of freedom.

This the writer would suggest is the realistic Harrington-Jefferson legacy and though time and space do not permit, nothing would please more than to trace how most of our great liberal parties from Jackson to Wilson have used that legacy well, so well in fact that it is one of the few characteristics that will distinguish and define, regardless of time or place, the American liberal and the tradition he has established. But that is another and much larger story.

---

<sup>24</sup> See for instance Parrington, *op. cit.*, III, 401-413.



## THE ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN DIPLOMATS TO THE KULTURKAMPF, 1871-1877

SISTER JOSEPH DAMIEN HANLON  
SAINT JOSEPH COLLEGE, BROOKLYN

The story of the Kulturkampf, particularly in the details of its internal ramifications and policies was the subject of minute and meticulous reports from the American diplomats to the State Department. They form a fruitful addition to our knowledge of the conflict as seen through the eyes of foreign nations, as well as fascinating material in the rich store of our National Archives.

In the years when the Kulturkampf was at its height, the United States had the good fortune to have at the Berlin Embassy two keen, capable and interesting men, namely George Bancroft from 1867 to 1874 and John Chandler Bancroft Davis from 1874 to 1877. Despite the fact that in the decade from 1870 to 1880 political relations between Germany and the United States were rather stagnant, as the political spheres of the two countries did not cross upon any highly important issues,<sup>1</sup> still it was a matter of foresight to have had upon the scene during the evolution of the Empire men who had the penetration to report minutely upon the domestic development of a nascent world power. Few Americans could have brought to the task a better sympathy and understanding than did the eminent United States historian, George Bancroft.<sup>2</sup> Not only had an early training at Gottingen University given him an invaluable familiarity with the German language and customs, but it had also influenced the philosophical trend of his thought<sup>3</sup> and had filled him with a deep sense of kinship in and sympathy for German thought and culture. Naturally, his well-known pro-German attitude assured

<sup>1</sup> Count Otto Stolberg-Werngerode, *Germany and the United States of America During the Era of Bismarck*, trans. from the German (Reading, Pa.: Henry Janssen Foundation, 1937), p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Kelly McClure, *George Bancroft* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1888), pp. 3-4: Bancroft was born at Worcester, Mass., in 1800; graduated from Harvard, 1817; received a Ph.D. from Gottingen, Germany, 1820. He was then a Greek tutor at Harvard until he established the Round Hill School at Northhampton, Mass., with Dr. Cogswell in 1823. In 1834 the first volume of his *History of the United States* appeared which by 1872 comprised ten volumes.

<sup>3</sup> Russell Nye, *George Bancroft* (N. Y., 1944), p. 243: Bancroft saw in German unification the working out of his idea of progress and the ultimate trend of Germany toward following the pattern of the American form of government. cf. Andrew McFarland Davis, "George Bancroft", *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXVI (Aug. 10, 1920), 4.

him a cordial acceptance in Berlin. At once he was received into the inner circle of the scholarly and political world.<sup>4</sup> The Bancroft home on the Thiergarten at Berlin was the scene of many brilliant and important gatherings both in the years Bancroft served as Minister to Prussia (1867-70) and in those that he served as Minister to the German Empire (1870-74). Moltke, Mommsen and Droysen were among his frequent visitors, while Bismarck and Bancroft enjoyed a friendship that afforded the American diplomat the unusual privilege of frequent trips to Bismarck's home at Varzin.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Bismarck went so far as to say that in his opinion Bancroft was the ideal American Minister.<sup>6</sup>

Bancroft was a man of strong convictions and nowhere is this more evident than in his attitude and approach to religious beliefs. Fortunately, he has left many outspoken testimonials as to his views on the question of religion in various private letters. As several of these letters were written during his ministry in Germany, they form an invaluable basis for ascertaining the amazing interest he evinced in the whole question of the Kulturkampf and help to indicate the reason for innumerable lengthy despatches to the Department of State concerning the internal involvements of Bismarck's war on religion. Bancroft's apparent tone of bias may be glimpsed even within these more formal diplomatic reports. In 1822, on his return from Gottingen, Germany, Bancroft had had sufficient interest in the Unitarian movement of his day to consider adopting the profession of the ministry, and, in fact, even preached in his father's pulpit.<sup>7</sup> However, Bancroft soon developed a dislike for Unitarianism and came to hold mainly and implicitly to the minimum idea of belief in the existence of an all-wise Providence, which directed

---

<sup>4</sup> Mark Antony De Wolfe Howe, *The Life and Letters of George Bancroft* (2 vols.; N. Y., 1908), II, 166. Politically he had had considerable experience as he had been Secretary of the Navy in Polk's administration in 1845 and from 1846-49 he had been Minister at the Court of St. James.

<sup>5</sup> William Sloane, "George Bancroft in Life, Politics and Letters," *The Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine*, XXXIII (Jan. 1887), 473 and 486.

<sup>6</sup> Stolberg-Werngerode, *op. cit.*, p. 99. The author notes that Bismarck remained on good terms with most of the American diplomats. This was due to Bismarck's desire to make use of antagonistic trends between England and the United States in Germany's favor.

<sup>7</sup> Samuel Swett Green, *George Bancroft* (Worcester, Mass.: Charles Hamilton Press, 1891), p. 19.



the movements of the universe and controlled the most minute events.<sup>8</sup> In general, his views on theology would be regarded as very broad and probably quite radical by the Protestant ministers of his day. A Rev. Shippen once said of him:

On one occasion he said to me with his quick, emphatic way, 'I am not an Episcopalian! I am a Congregationalist . . . . However, we never talked theology, and my impression is that Mr. Bancroft cared little about it.'<sup>9</sup>

The most complete concept of Bancroft's religious position may be found in a letter he wrote to Rev. Samuel Osgood from Berlin on Christmas Day, 1871:

. . . . I will now only say that I remain as ever in time past in the faith that Christianity is the religion of reason, is Reason itself; and therefore, I most cordially agree that it existed from the beginning, and is the whole of the eternal Reason itself. In other respects I am with increasing years more and more pleased with the simplicity and freedom of the New England congregational system; and seeing the abuse of symbols, I am quite in full sympathy with the Puritan dread of the use of them. The Jesuits all over the world are now striving to introduce a system which denies the use of reason in religion; and denies the right of the individual to a direct dependence on God. To carry out this system, civilization must go back; the beams of the state must decay from dry rot; and the eyes of the people must be put out. I adhere to the protestant doctrine, the great teaching of Luther, that every man is his own priest; and this is but the statement in respect of religion of the principle which divides ancient civilization from the modern . . . .<sup>10</sup>

Within this letter one finds a strong expression of his dislike and distaste for things Catholic and his adherence to the oft repeated notion that Catholicism is synonymous with retrogression in civilization. Two years earlier, in 1868, to the same Rev. Samuel Osgood, he had given an even more vituperative outburst as to his opinion of Catholicism:<sup>11</sup>

. . . . In theology the most marked phenomenon in Europe is the concentrated unity and activity of the Roman clerical party. No band of conspirators was ever more closely wielded

<sup>8</sup> Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> Watt Stewart, "George Bancroft," *The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography*, ed. William T. Hutchinson (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Howe, *op. cit.* II, 262-3, letter from George Bancroft to Rev. Samuel Osgood, Berlin, Christmas, 1871.

<sup>11</sup> It seemed logical to offer the letter in 1871 first as it presents more of Bancroft's own positive belief, while this latter epistle emphasizes what he negates as being unworthy of religion.

together. The one will of the Pope rules the creed, the politics, the conduct of all. The selfsame malign influence is at work in Spain, in France, in Rome, in Italy, in Southern Germany and in Austria. Nay it extends to England and North Germany and the United States. There are very many good Catholics in Germany who believe that religion suffers from the possession of temporal power by the Pope; but the utterance of such an opinion is no longer tolerated; the very thought is condemned as heresy. So we must not treat this aspect of Catholicism with the forbearance of sentimentality and imagination; the attempt at tyranny over mind and in the state is too terrible to be favored or forgiven. We must rekindle the lights of puritanism; and I find myself ready to make war on superstition and servitude of mind in all its forms; . . . .<sup>12</sup>

Letters written during the Franco-Prussian war offer strong evidence of antipathy for France, based not so much upon his natural liking for Germany as upon his aversion for Catholicism which he felt was an integral part of the French of his time.

The scarlet woman of Babylon is in a bad way. Her Jesuits and ultramontanes and intriguers are all on the side of Napoleon. France is considered as the champion of Catholicism against Protestantism. The old Pope being declared to be God on earth infallible (a monstrosity that cannot be paralleled since the days of the Caesars) is sure of his infallibility, yet after all not quite so sure.<sup>13</sup>

. . . . when the protestants were driven out, France was maimed, and left to the struggle of extremes.<sup>14</sup>

The war of France against Germany was stimulated from the Vatican . . . .<sup>15</sup>

That Bancroft felt in his outspoken religious opinions, he expressed those of his country as well, is evident in a remark he made to Hamilton Fish:

Germany like America is adverse to ultramontane usurpations.<sup>16</sup> It is quite obvious from this array of observations that in the matter of the Kulturkampf, Bancroft and Bismarck would have much in common. Both were equally disturbed by the con-

<sup>12</sup> Howe, *op. cit.*, II, 203-4, Bancroft to Samuel Osgood, Berlin, Feb. 21, 1868.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 240, Bancroft to Mrs. J. C. Bancroft Davis, Berlin, Sept. 4, 1870.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 228, Bancroft to C. C. Perkins, Berlin, June 12, 1869.

<sup>15</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, May 26, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 486. This is evident acceptance of Bismarck's assertion of the same. cf. Bismarck, *op. cit.*, II, 92.

<sup>16</sup> Howe, *op. cit.*, II, 246, Bancroft to Hamilton Fish, Berlin, Oct. 18, 1870.

licts between the state and the Catholic Church.<sup>17</sup> In a conversation between the two as early as 1867 Bancroft agreed with Bismarck that "there were principles in the Catholic religion which made it unfavorable to political freedom."<sup>18</sup>

The attitudes and position of Bancroft in regard to Germany and the Church in these years were carried on in a more moderate and conservative strain by George Bancroft's successor and nephew, John Chandler Bancroft Davis, who arrived in 1874 after Bancroft had requested his release from the State Department.<sup>19</sup> Davis had been Assistant Secretary of State during the Franco-Prussian War and had evinced an equally strong pro-German stand as had his uncle. As Secretary of the Legation at London in 1849, Secretary of the Joint High Commission on the Alabama Claims in 1871 and as Assistant Secretary of State once again from 1873-74,<sup>20</sup> Davis brought a wealth of experience to his position as Minister to Berlin. Both Bancroft and Davis were fortunate in having Hamilton Fish as Secretary of State during their terms at Berlin. Fish, prior to his appointment had had no experience in diplomatic affairs and as a result he leaned upon others more experienced than himself for advice, and even for the formulation of his policies and the drafting of instructions. Yet, despite his deference to the judgment of others, Fish proved himself a more than able Secretary of State on his own merits due to his long-range policy, moulded largely on the basis

---

<sup>17</sup> Stolberg-Wergerode, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 282, Appendix II A, the Bancroft-Bismarck interview, Thursday, Sept. 26, 1867.

<sup>19</sup> Henry Herbert Edes, "John Chandler Bancroft Davis", *American Anti-Quarian Society Proceedings*, 1908, p. 17: Davis was a prominent layman in the Protestant Episcopal Church; Jeanette Keim, *Forty Years of German-American Political Relations*, Ph.D. dissertation for Univ. of Penn (Philadelphia: printed by William J. Dornan, 1919), p. 307: The close kinship between Davis and George Bancroft gave to their correspondence during this period a freedom and informality which resulted in very frank comments on the international situations and policies. The entire J. C. Bancroft Davis Correspondence and Journal is in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, Wash. D. C. Some eighteen volumes cover the decade of the 1870's. There are no remarks in this correspondence pertinent to the religious issue as such. However, there is an interesting and detailed correspondence indicating that Davis's replacement of Bancroft had been specifically requested by Bancroft. It seems to warrant the assumption that Bancroft expected Davis to be in full agreement with his views, including those touching upon religion.

<sup>20</sup> Edes, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15.



of inherent qualities of caution and patience.<sup>21</sup> It was, perhaps, these characteristics that caused him to appreciate the careful minutiae of both Bancroft and Davis's reports, while maintaining a consistently non-committal attitude towards the domestic troubles of Berlin in matters of religion. Certainly the newspapers of the United States significantly pointed to a more dangerously interested participation on the part of the American populace.<sup>22</sup> Fish, in preserving silence, wisely followed the traditional policy of non-intervention by the United States in foreign affairs.

Throughout the year 1871 Bancroft maintained a keen interest in the results of the dogma of infallibility, not only upon the German Empire, but also in its ramifications as felt by Austria-Hungary particularly.<sup>23</sup> Within the German Empire, his attention fixed upon Bavaria as the most heated center of religious controversy.<sup>24</sup> Bancroft was keenly aware that Döllinger's rejection of the dogma, as well as the confidence and protection he enjoyed from the King of Bavaria made a conflagration and schism a real probability.<sup>25</sup> His conjectures were confirmed a few months later in the formation of the Old Catholic movement.<sup>26</sup> The disregard of the Catholic Bishops in Bavaria of the law forbidding the publication of the papal bull without the consent of the king had caused the contest and antagonism to spread throughout all Germany.<sup>27</sup> As an answer to the unrest, Prussia abolished the separate department for Catholic schools in the Ministry of Edu-

<sup>21</sup> Joseph V. Fuller, "Hamilton Fish", *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, Samuel Flagg Bemis (editor), 10 vols.; N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1929, VII, 123: Fish was Secretary of State from March 11, 1869, to March 11, 1877.

<sup>22</sup> Sister M. Orestes Kolbeck, *American Opinion on the Kulturkampf (1871-1882)*, Doctoral dissertation for Catholic University (Wash. D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1942).

<sup>23</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Sept. 2, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 256; Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Oct. 23, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 281.

<sup>24</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, July 28, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 248; Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Sept. 2, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 256.

<sup>25</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, April 10, 1871, no. 212 in *Dept. of State Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the U. S.* (Wash. D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1871), p. 381. no. 169.

<sup>26</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, July 28, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 248.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

cation.<sup>28</sup> The meeting of the Austrian and German Emperors at Gastein in September, 1871, brought to the fore the topic that was ever in mind and it was decided:

Respecting the temporal power of Rome there could also be no action; for there is nothing to be done about it. Austria does not mean to intervene about it; still less does Germany; and least of all Italy. . . . Prince Bismarck does not intend to surrender the power of the Crown to the ultramontane clergy; but he cannot estimate beforehand the strength of the blow it will be necessary for him to strike. . . . You may therefore rely on it that the meeting at Gastein had no other political object than a manifestation in the face of Europe that the past was to be considered as past.<sup>29</sup>

In November, the measure was proposed by Bavaria in the Imperial Diet to take from the pulpit its immunity lest sedition and treason be preached.<sup>30</sup> In discussing the passage of the "pulpit bill" in December, it is rather interesting to note that Bancroft makes a major item of a minor passage of the debate during the second reading. It seems indicative of the trend of Bancroft's own thought on the subject:

. . . . Mr. Von Lutz, the most important member of the present ministry of Bavaria, gave an account of an official interview which he had two years ago with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Passau. In the course of it he remarked: "The Bishop at that time made to me a thorough political exposition, in which he explained that, do what one would, the church strives for supremacy of state. It had up to this time made the experiment with all forms of government, and had not yet attained its end. Out of absolutism in the present times, nothing more was to be made. Constitutionalism had not yet proved itself a suitable means for establishing the dominion of the Church. Now the Church was striving for

<sup>28</sup> Bancroft to Fish, July 28, 1871. Corrigan, *The Church and the Nineteenth Century* p. 209. Prussia had already had a series of minor disturbances, as the controversy at Bonn University over the right of the Archbishop of Cologne to require theological professors to declare their acceptance of the dogma on pain of being forbidden to lecture or perform their priestly functions. Herr von Muhler, the Minister of Public Worship, insisted that they were responsible in matters of education to the Government alone, Dawson, *The German Empire*, I, p. 428.

<sup>29</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Sept. 2, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 256.

<sup>30</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Nov. 20, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 298; Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Dec. 4, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 304, he observes: the bill was passed. Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 429 adds: the "abuse of the pulpit" was an offence punishable by imprisonment for a maximum term of two years.

other means. It would next connect itself with the democracy and the masses in order to obtain the proposed end." Adds Bancroft: this anecdote is the more remarkable as Mr. Von Lutz is himself a Catholic, though opposed to clerical domination in temporal things.<sup>31</sup>

Most noteworthy of all, in this same report, immediately following the above remark, Bancroft makes the apparently irrelevant and yet highly significant comparison that:

It is well understood in Germany that during our civil war, the sympathies of the ultramontane Catholics were strongly enlisted for the southern insurgents.<sup>32</sup>

This analogy coincides with Bancroft's ardent belief in a Germany modeled on the American pattern, a Germany faced with difficulties similar to ours in that the Centre Party stood for states' rights as opposed to centralization, as had the southern insurgents, while the generally unsympathetic attitude of Catholics anywhere to unified political control is to be accepted as fact and so commiserated. This same conception of Catholicism as ever seeking to divide a nation in order to strengthen itself, is again evident in a report a few months later:

The union of the twenty five German States, forming the leading power in Central Europe, with a Protestant at its head as Emperor, alarms the ultramontanes. In their desire for power they aim at introducing divisions between branches of the German people, as well as between the German princes, and at obtaining the sole direction of the education of the Catholic population.<sup>33</sup>

Bancroft complacently adds: "the movement which was initiated in order to divide the people and princes of Germany only serves to consolidate their union."<sup>34</sup> This acceptance without question of Bismarck's view of the Catholic issue, well illustrates the communion of mind between the two men.

The frequent excommunications by the bishops<sup>35</sup> of those who refused to accept the decrees, posed problems for the Prussian state as to how they might devise measures to safeguard certain "rights" of the individuals resulting from such excommunica-

<sup>31</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, Dec. 4, 1871, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, I, no. 304.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, March 18, 1872, Dept. State. *Despatches, Germany*, 2, no. 343.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, May 26, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 486: "Excommunication had been used as an implement of strength and aggression."



tions for "the government would not tolerate the ban which interrupted social and commercial relations".<sup>36</sup>

It may become necessary to give to marriage in all cases the character of a civil contract . . . the question is also extending necessarily to church property. The right of the schismatic priest to continue his functions is not to be denied; and not being displaced, he is to continue to enjoy the income belonging to his office.<sup>37</sup>

Germany thus decided to see to it that all the "rights" of the Old Catholics were retained.<sup>38</sup>

Bancroft fails to make mention of the disturbance in April over the attempted appointment of Cardinal Hohenlohe, brother of the anti-papal Prince Hohenlohe of Bavaria, as ambassador of Germany to the Holy See. As the cardinal was known to have been a friend of Döllinger and the Liberal school of Munich, and as he was a member of the Pope's senate, it would have been impossible for him to act at the Papal court as a representative of a foreign power. Naturally, Pius IX refused to accept the cardinal and it increased the bitterness already present in Germany.<sup>39</sup> It was also on the occasion of this debate over the appointment, that Bismarck uttered in the Imperial Diet the famous words: "Have no fear—to Canossa we shall not go, either in body or in spirit."<sup>40</sup>

The failure of the Cardinal's appointment raised the immediate cry that the Jesuits were to blame.<sup>41</sup> Measures against the Jesuits were instigated on the principle that no man could at the same time owe allegiance to two different powers, and that a member of the Society of Jesus is so devoted to the head of his order that he must be considered as capable of primary allegiance to no other power.<sup>42</sup> Upon this fallacious premise, a special committee was appointed, under the supervision of Rudolph von Gneist, to investigate the manoeuvrings of the Jesuits and to arrive at conclusions as to what was to be done to forestall further "con-

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, March 18, 1872.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> MacCaffrey, *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, I, p. 302.

<sup>40</sup> Dawson, *op. cit.*, II, 430.

<sup>41</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, June 17, 1872, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 2, no. 374: "How to deal with the Jesuits in Germany became a topic of earnest consideration only a few weeks ago . . . today, after a debate of five hours the Diet has come to a decision . . ."

<sup>42</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, June 17, 1872, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 2, no. 374.

spiracy" on their part.<sup>43</sup> The report of the committee, submitted to the committees of the various party factions in the Imperial Diet, resulted in the formation of a bill which ordained:

The order of the society of Jesus and its kindred orders and congregations are excluded from the territory of the German Empire. The founding of their establishment is forbidden. All existing establishments are to be dissolved within six months. Foreign members of these orders or congregations may be banished from the Empire. Native members may be refused residence or compelled to residence in fixed districts or places.<sup>44</sup>

The bill was carried by a vote of 183 to 101, "a great vote when it is considered that the minority was composed in part of liberals and radicals and socialists who objected to the measure, not from any want of sympathy with the majority, but from fear of a precedent."<sup>45</sup> It was an important measure as it was an enactment of the German Parliament for all Germany and thus became the law even for state and provinces where the Catholics formed the majority.<sup>46</sup> A few days later a proposition inviting the Chancellor of the Empire to lay before the next session of the Diet a law rendering marriage by civil forms obligatory in all cases was now adopted enthusiastically.<sup>47</sup>

It is justified by the necessity of providing for the legal marriage of Catholics who reject the Dogma of Papal Infallibility and as a consequence are excluded from the sacraments of the Catholic Church.<sup>48</sup>

By December the law for civil marriage had, however, not been passed.<sup>49</sup> It was to take another year for this to become an accomplished fact.

The allocution of the Pope to the Consistory of the Cardinals on December 23 broke the last link of diplomatic relations between the Papal See and the German Government. The German representative was withdrawn from the Holy See and by New Year the Pope and Germany were in open and definite antago-

---

<sup>43</sup> Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 431.

<sup>44</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, June 17, 1872.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, June 24, 1872, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 2 no. 376.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> Alexander Bliss to Fish, Berlin, Dec. 16, 1872, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3 no. 434. Bliss was the son-in-law of Bancroft and worked with him at the Legation.

nism.<sup>50</sup> The passage of the Papal allocution relating to the German government was forbidden publication in Prussia:

. . . . in the German Empire . . . efforts are made not only through secret machinations, but indeed by open force to overturn her from the very foundations. For men, who not only do not profess our most Holy Religion, but are even ignorant of it, usurp to themselves the power of defining the dogmas and rights of the Catholic Church. And while they oppress her inconsiderately, they do not hesitate insolently to assert that she has suffered no wrong at their hands . . . .<sup>51</sup>

In January, Adalbert Falk, the new Minister in Prussia of Public Worship and Instruction,<sup>52</sup> laid before the House of Deputies the draughts of three laws of Church reform, touching the training and appointment of the clergy, the rights of withdrawal from the Church and the creation of a Royal Court of Judicature for Church matters.<sup>53</sup> Bliss observes that the tenor of these laws was far more radical than had been anticipated, but that the Minister of Public Instruction in presenting them insisted he had received the undivided sanction of that entire Ministry.<sup>54</sup> "This remarkable group of laws should they pass into successful operation would, it is scarcely too much to say, effect in some districts a change second only to that brought about by Luther."<sup>55</sup> With the close of the Prussian Diet in the last week of May there had come the acceptance of legislation on the Church question that was of wide interest and importance.

After much reluctance and deliberation the government resolved to assert the paramount authority of the laws of the State against every encroachment or disobedience growing out of a coordinate or pretended superior allegiance to a foreign alien power . . . . The idea of interfering with freedom of conscience is utterly disclaimed, but the rights of the state are to be maintained against attacks under the veil of religion.<sup>56</sup>

Bancroft's use of the words "pretended" and "veil of religion"

<sup>50</sup> Bliss to Fish, Berlin, Jan. 6, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 442.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, an enclosure.

<sup>52</sup> Corrigan, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

<sup>53</sup> Bliss to Fish, Berlin, Jan. 17, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 447.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* That would not have been too difficult, as the previous year the Catholic section of the Ministry had been abrogated and they are the ones who would have objected most strongly. <sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, May 26, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 486.



in such a context seems indicative of his attitude of approval of Prussia's newly formed laws. By these laws every "spiritual officer in a Christian Church in Prussia must be a German and free from objections on the part of the government."<sup>57</sup> Every priest and minister now had to go through the work of a German Gymnasium, take a three years' course at a German university, or at least in some seminary that the state regarded as equivalent. The candidate had, further, to pass examinations approved by the state including philosophy, history, German literature and the classical languages. Ecclesiastical superiors had to communicate nominations to the government which could then veto the nomination if they so wished within a period of thirty days. No ecclesiastical discipline could be pronounced for having obeyed any of the laws of the state or as threats to prevent such obedience. To give efficacy to these laws, the royal tribunal over church jurisdiction, proposed in January, was established.<sup>58</sup> A further law facilitated secession from the Church by the simple process of having the dissentient declare before a local judge that he wished to withdraw. The written consent of a priest was no longer necessary.<sup>59</sup> Thus the administration of the church was brought as completely as possible under the state.

In September, Bancroft noted that the coming elections promised to be pervaded once again with the issue of "clerical strife". But "Germany is determined to maintain its nationality against all sorts of foreign influence [obviously meaning the Holy See]."<sup>60</sup> He adds: "I ought, perhaps, to inform you that one of the papers very widely circulated among the German Catholics is a communication purporting to be signed by Catholic bishops in twenty-four of the United States."<sup>61</sup> October 27, he comments:

The catholic clergy are obviously beginning to regret having commenced, within the state, a contest in which it is not possible for them to gain the advantage. The intelligent catholics themselves for the most part support the govern-

---

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* These preliminary drastic bills were known when passed as the "May Laws", Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 439.

<sup>59</sup> Bliss to Fish, Berlin, Jan. 17, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 3, no. 447.

<sup>60</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, September 29, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4, no. 523.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* Hamilton Fish made no comment concerning the actions of the bishops.

ment, and so have received from the Ultramontanes the nick-name of State Catholics. . . . The attitude of the Emperor William is not only approved by many of the most enlightened Catholics in his own dominions, but also by the majority of the influential catholics in Austria. . . . Europe, alike catholic and protestant, is sick of the boundless pretensions of the Roman see and is seeking how to avoid papal influence on the external and internal political relations of the state.<sup>62</sup>

It is in this frame of mind that a few days later Bancroft communicated to Fish with evident satisfaction that the Catholic prelates had failed to increase their strength at the elections of the new house of representatives for Prussia. "The ultramontanes have rather lost than gained."<sup>63</sup>

By the close of the year a law was in preparation for making civil marriage obligatory and also entrusting to civil officers the registry of marriages, birth and deaths. The purpose of this law was to overcome the restrictions and regulations of the Catholic Church concerning mixed marriages. Bancroft saw in this move a definite tendency of Europe "toward the American system of separating Church and State" and considered it a "long stride" towards making such a separation "possible".<sup>64</sup> December fifteenth the bill requiring civil marriage and registration had become law and now, according to the American diplomat, marriages between different religious confessions would not be made "to depend upon the caprices of the clergy."<sup>65</sup> The bill for establishing compulsory civil marriage for the whole German Empire was passed in the Imperial Diet the following March.<sup>66</sup>

In the Prussian province of Posen, where Count Ledchowski was archbishop, antagonism between civil and ecclesiastical

<sup>62</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, October 27, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4, no. 532.

<sup>63</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, November 1, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4, no. 535, marked private. This observation is rather illuminating as illustrating the set prejudice of his mind for Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 440 has the contrary to say: "In the elections to the Prussian Diet in November 1873, the Ultramontanes gained thirty two seats and became the strongest party in the Lower House . . ." In the Dec. 15, 1873 despatch, Bancroft leans more to Dawson's statement when in a tabulation he makes of the numbers of each party in the Prussian House, he shows by his figures that the ultramontanes had the second largest number.

<sup>64</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, December 1, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4, no. 544.

<sup>65</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, December 15, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4 no. 550.

<sup>66</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, March 30, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Ger-*

power was strongest.<sup>67</sup> As a result Archbishop Ledchowski was one of the first dignitaries of the Church to suffer. He refused to vacate his See when it was demanded that he do so. Prosecuted, and charged an impossible fine, the Archbishop suffered an imprisonment of two years. The Bishops of Treves and Paderborn and the Archbishop of Cologne incurred a like punishment in varying degrees of length.<sup>68</sup> But the German diet soon realized that such stringent measures savored too much of the appearance of persecution, and instead proposed that the example of Switzerland be imitated. In place of imprisonment they would forbid any recusant prelate to reside in his diocese.<sup>69</sup> At the closing of the German Parliament in April, 1874, a proviso expelling from the country ecclesiastics "who set themselves up above the laws" was confirmed.<sup>70</sup> Finally, by a law of May 4th, provision was made in case of a vacant bishopric after the former bishop had been deposed by judicial determination. The Upper President of the Province was to summon the Cathedral Chapter, in order that the vacancy might be filled by election. In case no election was performed, the Minister of Public Worship was authorized to appoint a commissioner to manage the real and personal property. This same rule was also to apply to bishoprics that were vacant more than a year, even where the bishop had not been deposed by the State. Similar provisions were made for filling vacancies among the priesthood.<sup>71</sup>

The department of State will see at one glance the importance of the measure. . . . To leave the Catholic population of the country without bishops will open the way for many chances of change, and the catholic hierarchy must die out or, as has happened in Russia, exercise its functions in subordination to the power of the state. There is no political

---

*many*, 4, no. 578: Bancroft speaks of the measure being passed by a "considerable majority". Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 441: says that the "measure was repellent to the consciences of many deputies and of a large number favorably disposed toward the Government and its policy.

<sup>67</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, December 8, 1873, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4 no. 547.

<sup>68</sup> Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 316; Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, April 27, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 5, no. 586.

<sup>69</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, March 30, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 4, no. 578.

<sup>70</sup> Bancroft to Fish, April 27, 1874.

<sup>71</sup> Bancroft Davis to Fish, Berlin, March 13, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 82.



question on which the great majority of Germany is so determined as on this.<sup>72</sup>

To the end of his position in Berlin Bancroft remained wholly in sympathy with the governmental cause of Germany. In one of his last despatches, he remarks upon the continuing "usurping disposition of the Vatican priesthood."<sup>73</sup>

In the midst of the campaign of 1874, which grew ever more heated, Bismarck was wounded at Kissingen, July 13, by a half-witted journeyman cooper, named Kullmann. As he was a Roman Catholic and a member of a Catholic organization, an attempt was made to fix the blame for the deed upon the clerical party, but as early as July 15, the United States legation felt that a proof of ultramontane guilt would not be forthcoming, a belief that was soon confirmed.<sup>74</sup>

The year 1875 witnessed the most violent phase of the religious struggle. Naturally, the laws of April and May 1874 gave great offense at Rome. On February fifth, Pope Pius IX issued an Encyclical Letter addressed to "his venerable brothers the Archbishops and Bishops in Prussia". In it the Pope boldly declared:

. . . . to all whom it concerns, as well as to the entire Catholic world, [we declare] that these laws are null, because they are contrary to the divine constitution of the Church. For it is not to the Powers of the earth that the Lord has committed the Bishops of His Church, in what concerns His sacred service, but to Peter, to whom He has committed His lambs and sheep.<sup>75</sup>

Davis adds: "The gauntlet thus thrown down was taken up at once at Berlin."<sup>76</sup> A succession of trials, convictions and punishments of bishops and priests followed.<sup>77</sup> A more momentous result was the immediate proposal of two laws by Dr. Falk in the Landtag for the management of the property of the Catholic Church and for the suppression of the payment of State aid to

<sup>72</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, April 27, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 5, no. 586.

<sup>73</sup> Bancroft to Fish, Berlin, May 25, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 5, no. 593, marked private.

<sup>74</sup> Nicholas Fish to H. Fish, Berlin, July 15, 1874, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 5, no. 4. Nicholas Fish was an assistant at the Berlin Legation. He was temporarily in charge while Bancroft Davis was on his way to replace his uncle, George Bancroft.

<sup>75</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, March 13, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 82.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>77</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, October 11, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 9, no. 184.

the Catholic clergy.<sup>78</sup> Deep excitement ensued over these measures. "The subject has been discussed at length, not only in the journals of Berlin, but in London and Paris."<sup>79</sup> Davis declared that the Papal encyclical and the resulting State measures had caused a division within the Roman Catholic Church between those who upheld the Pope and those who insisted that the Pope had no right or jurisdiction to claim any state law invalid as "the teaching of the Catholic Church expressly commands every Catholic to recognize as fully valid and binding, all state laws enacted in a constitutional manner."<sup>80</sup> This latter group also denied that any State law passed up to that time had overthrown the government of the Church or injured the inviolable jurisdiction of the bishops.<sup>81</sup> The bills of March had become law by April.<sup>82</sup> April also saw the passage of a bill for the repeal of clauses in the constitution of Prussia giving ecclesiastical corporations the right to manage their own affairs,<sup>83</sup> and the submission of a new measure to the Chamber for the sequestration of monastic property.<sup>84</sup> The debates in Parliament over the bill concerning the religious orders was conducted with acrimony on both sides. Davis mentions having heard the speech of Herr Windthorst on the subject and says: "Nothing could have been more bitter."<sup>85</sup> By May 3, Emperor William I had promulgated the passage of this law. It henceforth excluded from the territory of Prussia all religious establishments with the exception of such orders as devoted themselves exclusively to the care of the sick and these were to be under state supervision. Even nursing orders could at any time be closed by royal decree. No new orders could be established, nor could any existing one henceforth receive new members. The communities were to be given six months to dis-

<sup>78</sup> Davis to Fish, March 13, 1875.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, April 13, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 98. Dawson, *op. cit.*, I, 444 says the bill suspending grants to the Church in sees whose bishops and clergy refused to promise obedience to the previous laws, was known as the Bread-Basket Bill.

<sup>83</sup> This affected the Protestant Churches as well and was issued on the grounds that the Church and religious communities had abused the confidence of the state, Davis to Fish, Berlin, April 19, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 102, enclosure I.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>85</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, April 21, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 103.

perse, although this time could be lengthened to four years by the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs in those establishments set up for the education of the young. This was to give the government time to replace such institutions with a state educational system. Single members of a community might be given permission to remain to impart education, as Germany otherwise would have been faced with a tremendous problem of providing sufficient teachers. The state was to take over the management of this Church property, but the law stipulated that from the property of these establishments, the members were to be given some support.<sup>86</sup> Finally, the 1875 Prussian Diet passed a bill respecting the legal status of the Old Catholics. By it, the Old Catholics were given a right to share in the use of the Roman Catholic Churches and cemeteries. If the Old Catholics were in the majority in any town and there was more than one church, the Old Catholics were to be assigned the chief one and when churches were to be used in common they were to have the right of selecting the time when they would occupy them. Further provisions made stipulations as to the selection of clergymen and the division of the revenues between the Roman Catholics and the Old Catholics.<sup>87</sup> This law resulted, of course, in the abandonment by the Roman Catholics of many churches to the Old Catholics. Davis saw in all the measures of the past few years, the determined effort of the liberals of Germany to cripple the Catholic Church as a "political engine of reaction."<sup>88</sup>

Far more than his predecessor, George Bancroft, Davis interested himself in the effect that the religious disturbance within Germany would have upon the European world. From the absence of remarks relating to American attitudes, it is evident that as far as the United States State Department was concerned, the German internal troubles had no active interest for our government.<sup>89</sup> In April, Bancroft Davis noted:

. . . . it is charged that the Jesuits have endeavored to make an Austrian Italian French alliance against Germany, holding out to the Emperor of Austria the hope of revenge

---

<sup>86</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, May 3, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 109, enclosure. Davis made no comment upon it.

<sup>87</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, May 10, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 8, no. 113.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>89</sup> Hamilton Fish never replied to these long despatches on the Kulturkampf, except to send word in his instructions that they had been received and filed.



for Sadowa, to Italy the promise of the recognition of the Italian Kingdom as it exists, and to France the hope of revenge, coupled with new European alliances."<sup>90</sup>

Early in May, Davis observed the general disappointment of the Italian and German liberals over the failure of the Emperor to make a proposed trip to see the King of Italy. They had hoped that a personal interview between the two monarchs would harmonize the policies of the two powers against "what are regarded as the aggressive pretensions of the Papacy".<sup>91</sup> At the same time, Davis remarks upon the growing uneasiness and tension in Europe and correlates this with a religious agitation which was now spreading throughout the European countries, due to "the pretensions of the Vatican".<sup>92</sup> A few months later, the Emperor was well enough to undertake the contemplated trip to Italy. "It requires little political sagacity to comprehend that the great age of the Pope, and the attitude of Italy towards the Vatican make it desirable for Germany to maintain an ascendancy in the councils of King Victor Emmanuel."<sup>93</sup> So necessary was the Triple Alliance to maintaining a peace based upon war with the Vatican, that even differences of opinion and interest in Herzegovina were not allowed to rupture the union. Upon the alliance,

Count Andrassy leans . . . . for the support of his anti-ultramontane policy in Austria. It lends strength to Prince Bismarck in his contests with the Pope. And its power and influence reach into Italy and aid the liberal statesmen of that country in carrying out their Ecclesiastical policy."<sup>94</sup>

Against this alliance, the United States Minister pointed to the strength of the Papacy in Spain and France and quotes the Pope's complaints against powers which had not been equally "subservient". Among these, the Pope had, by implication, included the United States. Davis quotes this:

. . . . and if this spectacle [of Germany] afflicts your hearts with bitterness and forces you to turn your eyes elsewhere,

<sup>90</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, April 21, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 7, no. 103. This is an interesting comment but one which he fails to mention again. Whether Davis shared his uncle's antipathy for the Jesuits or whether he indicates this "charge" out of mere desire to present a complete picture as he viewed it, cannot be established from this small testimony.

<sup>91</sup> Bancroft Davis to Fish, Berlin, May 10, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 8, no. 113.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>93</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, October 11, 1875, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 9, no. 184.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*

let us go and seek for comfort on the other side of the ocean and we shall see—what things indeed shall we see? New objects of affliction and grief . . . .<sup>95</sup>

It is at this point that Davis makes one of the most telling statements indicative of his attitude of disapproval towards the present occupant of the Holy See, if not of the Papacy itself:

With such a spirit animating the Vatican, one cannot overestimate the value of the present alliances to Germany, or the importance of maintaining them, and of preserving the existing relations with Italy until a new Pope shall be chosen, an event which, in the natural course of things, cannot be far distant . . . .<sup>96</sup>

By the opening of the year 1876, the furor and wrangling of the previous year had undergone a noticeable decrease. The Kanzel paragraph of the new penal code put before the Reichstag, which aimed at those who preached publicly from the pulpit on matters concerning the state and its affairs, or any treasonable doctrines and which decreed imprisonment or incarceration in a fortress up to two years, was passed with evident reluctance and only by a small majority.<sup>97</sup> Dr. Falk's popularity was on the wane and the Centre party was renewing its attack in order to force his resignation from the Ministry.<sup>98</sup> As early as February, Bancroft Davis was quick to estimate the value of the change appearing towards the religious question. Germany, tired of the combat was tending towards conservatism and a desire for rest. An example of this was evident to Davis in the speculations upon the object of a journey of Cardinal Hohenlohe to Rome.

The press has freely expressed its wish for better relations between Berlin and the Vatican, and its hope that the Cardinal may be the bearer of an olive branch . . . . an intimation thrown out in a conversation yesterday by a friend of Prince Bismarck makes me think it quite possible that the visit is made to Rome with a view of making an advance if opportunity offers . . . .<sup>99</sup>

Apparently an opportunity did not offer itself as no more was said on the score of the Cardinal's trip.

---

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>97</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, February 7, 1876, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 11, no. 274; Davis to Fish, Berlin, February 14, 1876, *Despatches, Germany*, 12, no. 280.

<sup>98</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, May 1, 1876, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 14, no. 358.

<sup>99</sup> Davis to Fish, Berlin, February 7, 1876, Dept. State, *Despatches, Germany*, 11, no. 274.

During Davis's term, he had witnessed the height of the storm. He had seen archbishops, bishops and innumerable clergy deposed and schools, institutions and churches closed by the hundreds. Thousands of the people had been left without succor of the sacraments and the whole organization of the Church had been dislocated. The storm had reached its crest and now it would recede. There is evidence of this in the ebbing interest in the subject during the last year of Davis's reports from Berlin. Only once in an entire year is any mention made of the Catholic issue and then only in an indirect manner and in an unusual vein. Writing to the new secretary of state, William Evarts, in September of 1877, concerning a conversation he had had with Bismarck, Davis says:

. . . . He [Bismarck] spoke of the increase of Roman Catholics in America, and of the efforts of the Jesuits to convert the Southern Negroes, and said that he had been told that the Jesuits expected to make America their stronghold, and perhaps eventually to remove the Papacy there and govern Europe from America.<sup>100</sup>

Though abatement was evident, actual release from the German conflict was not to come until Leo XIII ascended the Papal throne.

---

<sup>100</sup> Stolberg-Werngerode, *op. cit.*, Appendix III, Davis to Evarts, Sept. 24, 1877, Berlin, no. 759, marked confidential, p. 303.



## A PERIPATETIC REVIEW

THOMAS L. COONAN  
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

*Celtic Sunrise*, by Diana Leatham. London. British Book Centre. 1951. pp. 192. \$2.75.

*James Stewart, Earl of Moray*, by M. Lee. New York. Columbia Univ. Press. 1953. pp. 320. \$4.00.

*The Jacobite Movement: The Last Phase, 1716-1807*, by C. A. Petrie. London. Macmillan. v. 2. 1950. pp. 221. \$2.75.

*Victorian Years 1841-1895*, by Élie Halévy. New York. P. Smith. 1951. pp. 507. \$6.00.

*Celtic Sunrise*, a brilliant distillation of celtic historiography, is, as its sub-title indicates, an outline of Celtic Christianity. The writer relies perhaps too much upon Arnold Toynbee's unsupported thesis of a rivalry between the Christianity of the "Celtic fringe" and the Christianity of Rome for the supreme control of the Church universal, but she does outline with real competence and in an attractive style the fascinating story of Celtic Christianity from its Gallo-Roman origins in the British Isles in the early third century to the re-catholicization of Europe in the sixth and seventh centuries by such astonishing genius-saints of Ireland as Colmcille, Columban, Gall and Firgil. Honey and wax were the Celtic symbols for holiness and learning, and the writer shows with almost definitive power that the Carolingian Renaissance was a climax of this traditional Celtic combination.

The author of *Celtic Sunrise*, who has written two other charming and scholarly Celtic studies, viz., *They Built on Rock* and *The Story of St. David of Wales*, is well versed in Celtic lore, and if the present study is somewhat derivative it is based at least on a judiciously eclectic use of the very best authorities.

This reviewer would quite agree with Helen Waddell that Miss Leatham's book is "a hive of the honey bee" had the author but spared us the vulgarly rhetorical and bigotedly nescient introduction to her gracious study, written by George F. MacLeod.

*James Stewart Earl of Moray* is not the type of biography that records both the private and public life of the person in question but is rather what its sub-title indicates—*A Political Study of the Reformation in Scotland*. The author seeks to prove that the success of Protestantism in Scotland was largely due to the preponderant influence of one man—the Earl of Moray, bastard brother of Mary Queen of Scots. When we consider the political prowess of William Maitland of Lethington, not to mention the

politico-religious ascendancy of John Knox, it seems like too large an order, and in attempting to establish an important aspect of his thesis, namely, that Moray, once he had been converted by Knox, pushed ahead in his political career primarily in order to advance the Protestant cause, our author finds himself resorting to special pleading. The hypothesis is that Moray was promoting a policy of conciliation between the Protestant nobles and Mary at home, and a pro-English policy abroad, in order to stabilize and insure the continued existence of the Reformed, or if you like, the Deformed, religion in Scotland. Moray's political jockeying is of course susceptible of such an interpretation; yet the fact that the advancement of Protestantism constantly furthered his own personal political aims weakens our author's hypothesis and forces him to turn apologist to account for many of Moray's movements.

In his treatment of the Scottish political scene from 1559 to 1570, the author is frequently hampered by lack of reliable evidence. In the opening paragraph to Chapter XI—"The York-Westminster Conference"—he is even forced to make this damaging admission: "A good deal of the following account, therefore, is unproven and unprovable surmise, but it offers, in the writer's opinion, the most reasonable hypothesis which can be constructed from conflicting and biased evidence available to us."

Unhappily the same statement can be made to cover most of the conclusions drawn by the author of this book, and it probably accounts for what he considers the "surprising" fact that so few of the figures in the exciting, controversial, and frustrating Marian drama in Scotland have received biographical treatment. In brief, Maurice Lee's study of James Stewart Earl of Moray is neither definitive nor convincing, but considering the character of the materials he had to work with, he presents a plausible case; and if there is any value in the *argumentum ad hominem* he has done a service to the history of Scotland in its most tortuous phase. The book is well written, includes an impressive list of works consulted and an adequate index, and the printing and binding, done by the Columbia University Press, are excellent and most attractive.

In *The Jacobite Movement: The Last Phase* Sir Charles Petrie, celebrated Irish archivist and historian, concludes his majestic study of the exiled Stuarts. In the first volume—*The Jacobite Movement: The First Phase*—he carries the story from the Glorious Revolution so-called to the lamentable failure of James

III, the Old Pretender, to unseat the usurping debauchee, George I, from the British throne in 1715. In the present volume he continues the story from the failure of the Fifteen through Bonnie Prince Charlie's near victory of the Forty-Five (1745) to the death at Frascati of his younger brother, the Cardinal Duke of York, known to his supporters as King Henry IX of Great Britain and Ireland, in 1807.

It would be difficult to think of anyone better equipped than Sir Charles Petrie, with his vast intellectual background, his intimate familiarity with all phases of Celtic lore, his consuming interest in international politics, and his enlightened humanitarianism, to undertake the strenuous and thankless task of portraying the twilight and sunset of the lost cause of the Stuarts. Sir Charles measures up to expectations. With rare detachment and erudite impartiality he views Jacobitism, not as the purely insular affair that it has been conceived of heretofore, but as a movement which cannot be properly understood unless viewed in the setting of the general European situation. In this manner he marshals fact after fact to show that the attitude of the French Government is often of more importance than that of some English territorial magnate or highland chief, and that it is at least arguable that only the existence of the English Channel prevented a war of British Succession comparable to the Wars of Spanish, Polish, and Austrian Succession.

In delineating the characters of James III, Charles Edward (Bonnie Prince Charlie), and Henry, duke of York, the author is in his element. He depicts the Old Pretender as a gracious and enlightened prince, albeit one who has lost confidence in the ultimate success of his cause and who in consequence resigns himself with Christian fortitude to the inevitable, while at the same time doing nothing to discourage the determination of his more ebullient son, Charles Edward. The author cannot help contrasting what might have been had England been ruled by such a prince during the American crisis instead of by the arrogant and bigoted ignoramus who lost the Thirteen Continental Colonies and the willing allegiance of the Irish Catholics.

The pathetic movements of Bonnie Prince Charlie in the highlands and the Hebrides after the defeat of Culloden form the high light of the narrative. The inherent nobility of the highland outlaws who protected him and the tragic heroism of Flora MacDonald who rescued him are graphically portrayed. The reader is made to experience the rough and ready hospitality, the



quick wit, the homey sincerity, and also the terror of an old aristocratic Gaelic world of clans, pipes and tartans that had been all but destroyed in the barbarous campaigns of William III. The fragrance of the heather produces nostalgia, as does also the whiff of the *uisgebeatha* to which poor disillusioned Charlie afterwards fell victim.

This interesting, provocative and enlightening study of the Jacobite Movement merits Sir Charles Petrie an honored place in the grand tradition of English speaking intellectuals. It will long stand as a monument to the cause of a line of gracious princes who lost because they failed to meet the crude standards, or lack of standards, of what appeared to Lingard as the "ramp of cads" who held the political reins of a generation of Englishmen singularly graceless and inhumane.

In his introduction to the revised edition of G. B. Adams' *Constitutional History of England* Professor R. L. Schuyler, notwithstanding increasing knowledge on the subject, adds nothing to the text on the ground that "re-touched portraits are rarely satisfactory." In *Victorian Years 1841-1895* by Élie Halévy, with a long supplement covering the years 1852 to 1895 by R. B. McCallum, we are presented with an attempt to fill the gap left in the unfinished *History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century*, written by one of the most celebrated historians and moral philosophers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—Élie Halévy. The attempt combines both imagination and skill but is so lacking in the mental subtlety, grasp of ideology and fact, analytical and synthetical ability, detached objectivity, and evocative lucidity of style of the master, that it is a sadly incomplete affair which makes one wonder if a distinct disservice has not been done to one of the most outstanding works of the great French intellectual. An experienced critic has said as much of Jean de Meun's continuation of Guillaume de Lorris' *Romance of the Rose*, and the falling off is painfully perceptible where Richard Bellings takes up Sir Philip Sydney's unfinished *Arcadia*. It is in fact a question whether such a thing can be done, and it is, to say the least, the part of prudence to suggest that such a thing ought not be done.

Élie Halévy did not write his *History of the English people* in chronological sequence nor did he live to complete it. Having dealt with the period from 1815 to 1841 in three volumes, he found himself living on borrowed time and turned to his epilogue, covering in two further books the years from 1895 to 1915. In what proved to be his last work, *The Age of Peel and Cobden*

(published posthumously in French in 1946 and in an English translation by E. I. Watkin in 1948), Halvey had begun to bridge the gap; and his English publishers, in presenting a new edition of the entire *History*, invited Mr. R. B. McCallum to contribute a supplementary section to link this volume with the concluding ones.

In the section dealing with the age of Peel and Cobden we see the master almost at his best, separating the political, social, and economic elements of British history and blending them so skillfully as to convey the sense of organic life, and so logically as to reduce to simple lucidity the clumsy, contradictory, undogmatic British developments of a period characterized by unusual political and ideological confusion. It is a great pity that Halévy did not live to bridge the gap, but as long as he did not, it is an outstanding example of the presumption of fools rushing in where angels fear to tread for his English publishers to commit the completion of his unfinished work to another—and indeed a lesser—man. Charity forbids the rapier thrusts that even the most superficial comparison would dictate.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### MEDIEVAL

*Everyday Life in Anglo-Saxon, Viking and Norman Times*, by Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell. Third Edition. 1952. pp. 116. \$2.25.

This is the fourth volume in the *Everyday Life* series written for "boys and girls" and published in the United States by the British Book Centre in New York. In this brief survey of three periods the authors try to convey, with many quotations from the limited sources, an idea of what life was like during these early centuries of English history. For the first period the authors rely largely on Bede and the story of Beowulf in describing the Anglo-Saxon invasions, the clothes, weapons, brooches, housing, mensuration and burial customs of the age. The most interesting pages concern the Sutton Hoo treasure discovered in 1939 about ten miles from Ipswich. The find was probably a cenotaph built in memory of king Athelere who was drowned in 655 during the battle of Winwaed. Photographs of three of the objects found suggest how highly developed were the arts of design and fine metal work in seventh century England.

The second chapter on the Vikings describes well their ships, the work of Alfred, social classes, church building and the influence of the Church. The final chapter on the Normans is based largely on Master Wace's *Chronicle of the Norman Conquest*. It covers the preparation of William for the conquest and carries the story through his arrival in London. The authors go into some detail on William's arrival in London, but the map which would have made the description easy to follow is in the third volume of the Series! The reader is also referred to "the much better one of Roman Britain published by the Ordnance Survey". This sort of thing might well be corrected in the fourth edition.

There is a sketch of Norman housing and chess men. Then the authors announce that "with superb artistry" they "have kept the really triumphant achievement of the Normans for our finale", that is the Norman church.

There are a few other things that might be corrected in a subsequent edition. After describing illumination in manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon times (pp. 39-40) the authors refer readers who are interested in the subject to read "Mr. Herbert's book", but no reference to the work is made in the bibliography. Again, perhaps not all will agree that "when Christ was born, Rome and Roman civilization was at a low ebb . . ." After reading of the invasions of the Angles, Saxons, Danes and Normans and of the resistance of the natives to each of these groups, it is strange to read the last paragraph of the book which begins: "England has welcomed many men. The Piltown Man of the Old Stone Age [the first synthetic Englishman?]; the Mediterranean men of the New Stone Age; and the Celts. Rome and her legionaires . . . Then came the Angles, Saxons and Jutes; the Vikings and Normans . . ." Did England "welcome" all these?

The authors have a disconcerting habit of frequently referring in the text to other volumes of the series as: "Others went to the baths which, as we saw in Part III, page 25, were large and well-planned". "As we last saw it



in Fig. 23, Part II the warp was stretched by warp weights". Such references make the style heavy and distract attention.

The volume has many interesting drawings, several excellent photographs and two color plates which are of great value to the text.

James R. Corbett, University of Notre Dame.

---

*The Art of War in the Middle Ages, A.D. 378-1515*, by C. W. C. Oman.  
Revised and edited by John H. Beeler. Ithaca, New York. Cornell University Press. 1953. pp. xviii, 176. \$3.00.

The present short survey is a prize-winning essay written by Oman while still a student at Oxford University, and originally published in 1885. John Beeler, who edits it critically in the Cornell series of significant summaries of important historical topics, provides supplementary information and references in footnotes and in bracketed additions within the text. The work is a good admonition to those who facetiously remark that such and such an historical treatise of a secondary nature must necessarily be "outdated" because it is a few decades old. For there are historical classics even among secondary works, which will long endure and excite admiration and respect, as well as edify novices in the craft, because of their brilliant insight, epochal interpretation, direct use of the sources, scholarly soundness, and superb style. Among such is the present flagon of old and valuable wine. It traces in bold strokes the development of warfare from the Later Roman Empire to the beginning of modern times. Its central theme is the rise, apogee, and passing of the predominance of heavy cavalry. In that story the performance of the Gothic cavalry in the Battle of Adrianople (378) was epochal. Shortly thereafter heavy cavalry became the principal arm of the Eastern Roman or Byzantine army. The evolution was slower in the West, but in the eighth century heavy cavalry won out in Frankland, and in the eleventh (with the Norman invasion) in England. Its heyday lasted until the fourteenth century. In the Later Middle Ages it passed reluctantly before the combined onslaught of varied new tactics employing English longbowmen, Swiss pikemen, and Hussite wagoners. In the mind of the present reviewer, Oman's stress on the utter lack of discipline, tactics, and strategy in feudal warfare is exaggerated. Especially, this earlier work of Oman does not adequately bring out the part played by the utilization of gunpowder in the Later Middle Ages, nor is the defect supplied by the editor. Nevertheless, we have here a survey of important features in the evolution of warfare in the Middle Ages, convenient for collateral reading by students of general and mediaeval history.

Daniel D. McGarry, Saint Louis University.

## MODERN

*Struggle for Africa*, by Vernon Bartlett. Frederik A. Praeger. New York. 1953. pp. ix, 246. \$3.95.

Vernon Bartlett, one-time *London Times* foreign correspondent, *News Chronicle* foreign affairs advisor, author of fifteen books, was for twelve years a Member of Parliament, and many times a member of British

diplomatic and United Nations missions. His book is a comprehensive survey of the Black Continent's economic, political, social and cultural problems. It is, on the author's word, not written for the expert but to stimulate general interest in this amazing continent.

It may be called a tragic situation Mr. Bartlett has undertaken to describe. We are familiar with the notion that there is a struggle for Africa; there is, for example, the rapidly increasing literature specifically covering the southern part of the continent (a.o. *The Mistaken Land*—by Michael Ardizzone; *Struggle for Equality*—by P. S. Joshi). But if we ask who are the parties engaged in the fight, answers differ. Mr. Bartlett is looking upon the whole problem mainly from the point of view whether the white man will be expelled and Africa will become a black man's continent. However, there is a third party, somewhat a secret one, involved in the scene: The Communists.

It is true that Africa is on the move and that colonialism is about to vanish. Actually we have four independent countries governed by the natives: Egypt, Ethiopia, Liberia and Libya. In a near future we will have four more; the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan will become independent in 1956, Somaliland in 1960, The Gold Coast probably by 1955 and Nigeria somewhat later. There can be no doubt that the rest of the continent will follow the same way, and especially French Africa, the Belgian Congo, Portuguese Africa in the long run will not be in a position to maintain their actual status of colonies of European nations. The review would be incomplete, however, if we did not mention the wealthy and well organized Union of South Africa which, in contrast to the countries named above, is dominated by whites and may be called a powerful factor determining to a large extent the future of the Dark Continent. The author in the opinion of this reviewer was right in placing the chapter concerned at the beginning of his study. Mr. Bartlett, who is extremely cautious in judging the situation, comes to the conclusion that the government of Dr. Malan is destroying the hope and faith of the Black man; the nationalist leaders have adopted an interpretation of "apartheid" which seems, as he says, very closely related to serfdom. The Union of South Africa, called upon to become a leader in building up a future of the Dark Continent based upon the white *and* the black man, has adopted a policy of suppression which is endangering Africa as a whole. Quoting The Group Areas Act and the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, the author reports that in 1952 the first "private prison" was opened by the Minister of Justice. A group of farmers built a jail on condition that the government kept it full of prisoners! The state gets 25 cents a day for the work done by these prisoners on the local farms. The farmers get their cheap labor and the prisoners get nothing. Prisoners can easily be brought in on charges based upon execution of the Acts mentioned above, supplemented by the use of the Suppression of Communism Act which can be used "to silence anybody who ventures to criticize its enforcement."

As to Communism itself, the author is not offering detailed information as to how far the poison may have penetrated the black population. We may perhaps get an idea of this from the chapter covering the situation of the Gold Coast. Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, a political leader, who following the

statement of the Watson Commission in 1948 "has not really departed one jot from his avowed aims for a Union of West African Soviet Socialist Republics", has won a smashing victory—while in prison—in the elections of 1950. On the other hand we know that Communist agents posing as nationalists are active in French Africa, especially in Morocco. In addition, the press reports that the Communist movement is spreading in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan: The Communists are financed from the outside but nobody seems to know through what channels. Getting evidence to prove suspects involves a lot of difficulties, however, there is some certainty that students and workers have become the victims of the propaganda.

This reviewer believes that a book dealing with the situation in Africa should cover the activity of the third party involved, the Communists, in a more complete way than offered by the author. It is true that the Black man will not accept inequality of treatment and status permanently. It is also true that the great colonial powers have no longer capital and technicians to permit the rapid development of the Dark Continent. For example, there are only 3,400 doctors there instead of the 60,000 needed. But we would like to get more suggestions as to how to solve the problem. We realize the difficulties of offering details, but there are some principles which never should be omitted in discussing the way out of the dilemma. We should repeat that only tolerance will secure internal peace and progress, that suppression will bring internal troubles and finally revolution. But there is one statement, this reviewer agrees with completely as to the dangers we are facing. Says Mr. Bartlett: "We must make partnership a reality and we have little time to do it".

Henry K. Junckerstorff, Saint Louis University.

---

*The Rise and Decline of Liberalism*, by Thomas P. Neill. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1953. pp xi, 321. \$5.50.

In this book as in his recent *Makers of the Modern Mind*, Dr. Neill shows a rare gift for clarifying, simplifying, and above all making concrete, the great moral and political bundles of ideas we must all struggle to understand in this modern world. What is even rarer, he can achieve clarity and simplification without falsifying, without losing a sense of the complexity with which true and false, good and bad, are interwoven in these bundles of ideas.

Even those who are not immediately interested in liberalism or in nineteenth-century history should profit by Dr. Neill's first chapter on "Liberalism: Toward a Definition of the Subject." For at the level of human group-relations, all the great terms of theology, philosophy, art and literature, yes, of natural science too—all the "isms," in short—have the kind of varied, often mutually contradictory, specific uses and meanings Dr. Neill here analyzes in "Liberalism." Some of those uses may seem to the historian tortured and illogical, but he has to record them, has to try to understand how men arrived at them.

Dr. Neill distinguishes between ecumenical liberalism, which is at bottom one form of the belief in the dignity of man, and sectarian Liberalism, the set of beliefs and purposes held by men more or less specifically organized as a political party. His book traces the growth of sectarian Liberalism from



its origins in the Renaissance and Reformation to its nineteenth-century flowering; in the nineteenth century he distinguishes three phases, each growing out of the other but with no sharp chronological dividing points—Classical, Democratic, and Welfare Liberalism. In its last phase, sectarian Liberalism has come to hold on certain problems, notably on government intervention in economic life, in education and in much else, a position diametrically opposed to its original one. Jefferson wanted less government intervention; New and Fair Dealers want more. Dr. Neill will discuss in a separate volume for later publication how this last phase of Liberalism has developed in the twentieth century.

This promised volume should make clear Dr. Neill's own position on just what has survived of sectarian Liberalism in mid-twentieth century. Already in this book on the nineteenth century it is clear that he believes that the Liberal's quest for perfect happiness on earth for everybody had begun to drive him toward totalitarian solutions, that the original Liberal sympathy with the freedom and dignity of all men had so far disappeared that the relation between "Liberal" and what common sense—and Christian tradition—calls "liberty" had turned into a rather unpleasant paradox.

Crane Brinton, Harvard University.

---

*The Nature of Historical Explanation*, by Patrick Gardiner. London. Oxford University Press. 1952. pp. xii, 142. \$2.00.

*What is History?*, by V. Gordon Childe. New York. Henry Schuman. 1953. pp. 86. \$1.00.

*Christianity and the Problem of History*, by Roger L. Shinn. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1953. pp. xiv, 302. \$4.50.

*The Origin and Goal of History*, by Karl Jaspers. New Haven. Yale University Press. 1953. pp. xvi, 294. \$4.00.

The field of interest generally referred to as "the philosophy of history" was long avoided by both historians and philosophers because it is not properly either history or philosophy. The revolutionary disturbances of the last generation, however, coupled with the increased rate of speed at which momentous events occur have driven thinking men from both disciplines to inquire about the nature of history. Whereas Spengler stood alone for almost a generation, now one finds a dozen books a year purporting to explain the nature of history. This interest in the pattern of the past is due largely to an interest in the present and the future: if the big lines of development can be etched and a pattern revealed, we can understand better where we stand today and whither we are going. A second reason for this revived interest in a philosophy of history is man's natural desire to explain the ways of God to man and of men to men.

*The Problem of Historical Explanation*, however, is concerned with a preliminary task—that of validating history as a subject. Gardiner defends history against those who deny that we can gain objective knowledge of the past, and against those who condemn history for failing to be a "true science." He demonstrates that the historian is interested in the significant, concrete happenings of the past, that he can obtain, record, and largely explain these past events. He shows, against the natural science devotee, that history need not be an experimental science to be a valid body of

knowledge. A section on causality in history handles the complex problem of context and causality, motive and necessity, environment and the personal factor, with lucidity. Gardiner's book explains well what the historian actually does, and it justifies his subject as a valid body of knowledge.

*What Is History?* is in the College Paperbacks series. Its purpose is "to show by a review of various theories of historical order what kind of order you may really expect to find in history." (p. 5) In summary and superficial fashion the author dismisses the various "theological," "magical," and "naturalistic" theories of historical order to arrive at the one he considers correct. This is the explanation of Marx and Engles' dialectical materialism wherein everything is explained ultimately in terms of production relations. This materialism, of course, does not deny the existence of ideologies or political institutions, but it explains them in terms of class relations—and these ultimately are determined by production relations. There is nothing new in the way Childe states the Marxian view. The book is disappointing for the naivete with which it dismisses other explanations of the historical process and states without qualification that the author's theory suffices to explain all historical happenings.

*Christianity and the Problem of History* is a good analysis of the problem from the Protestant point of view. Shinn does not differ markedly from Lowith, Barth, Niebuhr and others who stress the element of biblical eschatology for giving the key explanation of the meaning of history. The author insists that the historian, *qua* historian, is unable to elucidate a philosophy of history. Any ultimate explanation of the historical process, involving a consideration of its origin and goal, is bound to be theological in nature. Shinn holds the generally accepted view that Christianity views history as moving in a straight line (with many ups and downs of course) toward the final redemption of mankind. In this way it differs from the classical cyclical view. His description of the progress idea of history as a secularization of the Christian view is essentially the same as Berdyaev's and Dawson, and his analysis of the Marxian view as a Christian heresy is clearly in the Protestant-Catholic tradition.

This book is most valuable for describing rather well the various explanations of history from St. Augustine to Toynbee. The chapter on contemporary Catholic views suffers from almost exclusive reliance on Von Hugel and Dawson to the exclusion of more recent authors like Danielou. Nor is it correct to assert that "Neo-Thomism . . . generally assumes a retrogression of both thought and culture since the high tide of medievalism." (p. 171) Shinn is right, however, in believing that Protestants are more readily inclined to work out philosophies or history than are Catholics, for "Protestant thought . . . is more skeptical of the adequacy of metaphysical theories . . . and lays more stress on the dynamic character of time." (p. 208)

This is an excellent book for one who wants a survey of Christian theories of history, as well as "heresy" theories of progress and Marxism. It is competently done.

*The Origin and Goal of History* sets forth a shema of past and present happenings that may come to rival Toynbee's and Spengler's patterns. Jasper's outline is based, he tells us, on an article of belief: "that mankind has

one single origin and one goal . . . All men are related in Adam, originate from the hand of God and are created after His image." (p. xv) The great and fruitful period of history is the "Axial Period" (800-200 B.C.). Jaspers sees the Western, Indian, and Chinese civilizations all enjoying similar awakenings at this time, and they follow similar developments until about 1500 A.D. Then a new element, science, changes the very nature of Western civilization—but its results today are to make world history a unit again. Jaspers indicates that we live in a second Axial Period, and that the future of history will be a single story of a single world-people.

The author's schema is more refined, of course, than the summary description here given can show. But the historian will object to it that it is too pat a picture of the past. The book is valuable for many insights that a man of Jasper's intellect has into the significance of past developments and for the many suggestions it makes for further investigation. His schema will be discussed in the years to come, and though it is not a definitive thing it is valuable for suggesting a new approach to arranging past events into some kind of meaningful pattern.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

### AMERICAN

*The New England Mind. From Colony to Province*, by Perry Miller. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1953. pp. xi, 513. \$6.50.

If Professor Miller's book did not have titles enough, one would almost be tempted to add another, "An Intellectual History for Intellectuals." Or putting it another way, this volume manifestly was intended for mature readers who already possess some background in the cultural history of New England. It assuredly was not planned as possible collateral reading for students taking Social Science I at Sandy Lake Junior High School.

The first one hundred years of Puritan civilization after the founding of their "city on the hill" is the period of time covered. And though the title of the volume suggests that this is a study of the New England mind, it is primarily the Massachusetts mind (and occasionally the Connecticut mind) that is considered. It would be instructive to know what the Rhode Island mind—or even the New Hampshire mind—was occupied with at the same time.

But despite the probable limits of appeal and the contracted scope of the subject matter, this study will undoubtedly rank as one of the most thorough and scholarly books written in mid-century. The amount of research done in the heavy theological writing of the era was prodigious. And the evaluation, condensation, and presentation of their content represents a task of which both the author and the Harvard University Press may well be proud.

At first, society in Massachusetts was simple and uniform, but as time passed, politics, business, witchcraft, disease, and upstart journalism crowded into the original New England experience. Life then became complicated and often less happy. As might be expected, the Mathers were in the center of most of the pressures of the era.

The author shows that a college in the Colonial period could be under suspicion and subject to investigation, just as sometimes is the case today.



In 1723, Harvard was the victim of what Professor Miller calls "an early form of inquest into un-American activities." A committee named by the Board of Overseers probed whether the school really kept up solid learning and whether its library was filled with Satanical books. It was a rough moment, but the appointment of an agreeable and conciliatory new president did much to end this early investigation of an American institution of higher learning.

As one reflects on the material in this book, amazement grows at the amount of ecclesiastical literature that was penned in the era. The Puritan was exposed to a mighty barrage of it, and even in the second generation, Urian Oakes observed that many had grown "sermon-proof". Considering the limited number of hand presses available, it is likewise surprising that such a quantity of theology actually made its way into print. And when one appreciates what a terrific mortality there is in historical records everywhere, there is final wonderment that so much remained imperishable for this author to use.

Professor Miller's book, complete in itself, is also a sequel to one that was originally published in 1939. It has a pleasant format, a splendid critical bibliography, and a detailed index.

Richard L. Beyer, Gannon College.

---

*Bonanza Trail*, by Muriel Sibell Wolle. Bloomington, Ind. Indiana University Press. 1953. pp. xvi, 510. \$8.50.

The mining frontier forms a unique chapter in the development of the west. And for the advocates of the Turner hypothesis it presents many problems. It is something like a piece of a jig-saw puzzle that looks like it is the right color and all, but when fitted it isn't cut just right. Perhaps one of the reasons is the lack of good primary material to tell the story fully. The miner came, dug, went broke and chased after the other end of the rainbow. One thing he did little of, and that was to leave a written record of his real activity. Newspapers were published in the mining camps, and frequently they were even farther from reality than the prospectors' own word. A strike meant a sudden boom town that might last a few months, a few years, or sometimes develop into a permanent city. The story of these settlements in the west is the burden of *Bonanza Trail*.

This work shows evidence of painstaking research, much travel and keen observation. The more than one hundred drawings help the printed word to convey the excitement of the mining camp. Ghost towns and mining camps from the Rockies to California are the burden of the book. For each there is an explanation of its beginnings and activities, as well as a picture of its present status—either in words, or sketch. Tombstone, Dillon, Silver City, Gold Bar, Frenchtown Bar, Virginia City, Central City, Cripple Creek are but a few of the places visited.

In *Stampede to Timberline* Mrs. Wolle covered the ghost towns and mining camps of Colorado. One would expect that section to receive favored treatment, but the amount allowed each section is well balanced. Her unique qualifications as Professor of Fine Arts and as an authority on mining history have been combined to best advantage.

One feature of the book that is very helpful is the Glossary of mining terms included. The selected bibliography is both very helpful, and very frustrating. The selection of books classified under each state gives the good titles available on the mining history of the region. But to merely list the titles of periodicals without specific references is annoying. Surely not all the titles in the periodicals listed deal with mining, and certainly there are some titles worth special mention.

E. R. Vollmar, Saint Louis University.

---

*Protestantism in America*, by Jerald C. Brauer. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press, 1953. pp. 307. \$3.50.

The story of Christianity in America continues to be the least cultivated area in our historical literature. Until recent years, historians of both the Catholic and Protestant Churches were like that trio of monkeys who could see, hear and speak no evil. Their chronicles were not so much histories as panegyrics of their churches; their biographies were not pictures of living men and women but sugary-sweet concoctions of plaster saints. There have been exceptions, of course; in Catholic history, the name of John Gilmary Shea comes instantly to mind. But until the second quarter of the present century the average denominational history well merited the opprobrious adjective of "filio-pietistic."

Even worse than the histories of individual churches have been those volumes which claimed to survey the history of all religions in the United States. Written in every case by Protestant clergymen, they equated American religion with white Protestantism. The great mass of the "unchurched" was ignored, a few paragraphs might be given to the Jews, a few pages to the Negroes. Invariably, toward the end of these volumes, there appeared a chapter on the Catholic Church marked by strong bias and by almost complete ignorance.

In recent years, matters have improved. The present book is a refreshing example of the change for the better. Doctor Brauer, a Lutheran minister and a professor of church history, does not claim that his history is the story of religion in America. He sets out to tell the story of Protestantism alone, and he sticks to his last. The Catholic Church is rarely mentioned—indeed, a minor criticism of the book might be that Protestant-Catholic relations do not receive adequate treatment. And there are but one or two statements which might give offense to Catholics. Other common mistakes of the past are avoided. The author's own theological beliefs do not color his story. Nor does he gloss over Protestantism's shortcomings and mistakes.

The book is intended as an introductory survey. It would be improper to expect the book to add new material to our present knowledge of American Protestantism. A survey must be based on published accounts. Since large areas of Protestant history have not yet been explored, the present work must necessarily reflect these *lacunae* in research. The author's bibliography is restricted to a listing of books cited. Many questions might be raised about the author's selection of details and the validity of his interpretations. When all reservations have been made, the volume remains a very good general survey of the history of American Protestantism.

Francis X. Curran, St. Francis Xavier's Church, New York City.

*Yankee Diplomacy: U. S. Intervention in Argentina*, by O. Edmund Smith, Jr., Southern Methodist University Press. Dallas. 1953. pp. 196. \$3.00.

In *Yankee Diplomacy* Dr. Smith presents a report, largely based on printed sources (governmental and private), of the vagaries of United States diplomacy in Latin America, with special attention given to the seemingly bewildering shifts in strategy and tactics, and special reference in these instances to Argentina since the beginning of the Peron regime. The title with its emphasis on "Yankee," in view of that word's commonly accepted implications in Latin America, is an indication that the author is an unfriendly critic, in the main, of our policies and practices.

After a jejune survey of such policies as intervention, the good neighbor, and hemispheric solidarity, Dr. Smith analyzes the "hard" (or "strong") and "soft" approaches of the United States to Latin American relations and indicates the apparent inconsistencies and reversals. He also presents various and differing Latin American doctrines or formulas, concerning, for instance, recognition and intervention as proposed by Estrada, or Guiani, or Rodriguez Larreta. He concludes that, in the future, the United States must be careful to avoid even the appearances of unilateral action and must work with and through regional, collective agencies (for instance, the Organization of American States), generally not assuming a dominating role or using coercive measures except as a last resort in real crises.

Some technical deficiencies, such as the lack of an index and organized bibliography and errors such as the consistent misspelling of the name of the United States Ambassador to Peru, Mr. Harold H. Tittmann, detract somewhat from the presentation.

Martin F. Hastings, Saint Louis University.

*South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900*, by George B. Tindall. Columbia. University of South Carolina Press. 1952. pp. xii, 336. \$5.00.

The title of this volume is unusually well chosen and descriptive in an historical era when it seems to have become incumbent to find an odd or striking phrase upon which to build a book. Further, the title is apt in that Professor Tindall's study covers all phases of the life of the South Carolina Negro in the quarter-century chosen. Much of his material on the political and economic life is not new or unusual; the real value of this work lies rather in the picture of religious, educational and social life which is presented. Such sections as the one on "Care of Indigent and Defective" represent attention to phases of Negro life not hitherto overworked and hence are of more value than sections which have been frequently studied.

The bibliography of contemporary source material is impressive although the annotations to most of the manuscript collections used would seem to indicate they were of little value for this study. The make-up and physical construction by the publishers add little to the volume.

Jasper W. Cross, Saint Louis University.



## CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is intended to be of service to teachers and students of history by presenting a fairly complete list of historical works announced or published since the previous issue of *The Historical Bulletin*. Many of these books will be reviewed in this or a later issue. Unfortunately sometimes the price and number of pages were not obtainable.

### MEDIEVAL

- Arnold-Baker, and Dent, *Dictionary of Dates*. Dutton. \$4.50.  
 Aspenleiter, F. J., *Western Civilization*. Loyola Univ. pp. 575. \$2.52.  
 Ausubel, Nathan, *Pictorial History of the Jewish People*. Crown. pp. 346. \$5.00.  
 Brogan, Olwen, *Roman Gaul*. Harvard. pp. 260. \$4.25.  
 Brogger, A. W., and H. Shetelig, *The Viking Ships*. pp. 248. \$5.50.  
 Burn, A. R., *Agricola and Roman Britain*. Mcmillan. pp. 192. \$2.00.  
 Crombie, A. C., *Augustine to Galileo*. Harvard. pp. 451. \$8.00.  
 Forsyth, A. H., *The Church of St. Martin at Angers*. Princeton. 2v. \$35.00.  
 Gazagne, Brother Louis, *The Saint on Horseback*. Dujarie Press. pp. 88. \$2.00. A brief biography of King Louis IX of France written especially for children.  
 Gaynor, Frank (ed.) *Dictionary of Mysticism*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 210. \$5.00.  
 Goodenough, E. R., *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Pantheon. 3v. \$25.00.  
 Greek *Civilization and Character*. New Amer. Lib. pp. 158. pap. \$0.35.  
 Latourette, K. S., *A History of Christianity*. Harper. pp. 1543. \$9.50.  
 Long, E. J., *Two Thousand Years*. Exposition Press. pp. 324. \$4.00.  
 Queffelec, H., *Saint Anthony of the Desert*. Dutton. \$3.75.  
 Quennell, M. C., and C. H. B. Quennell, *Everyday Life in Anglo-Saxon, Viking and Norman Times*. 3d. rev. ed. British Bk. Centre. pp. 122. \$2.25.  
 Ricciotti, G., *Paul the Apostle*. Bruce. pp. 551. \$7.50.  
 Thiry, Paul, et al., *Churches and Temples*. Reinhold. \$18.00.  
 Weber, N. A., and J. L. White, *Civilization, Ancient and Medieval*. Catholic Educ. Press. pp. 373. \$5.00. text ed. cloth \$3.88. A revised edition of the earlier high school text, *A General History of the Christian Era*, to which has been added a treatment of the pre-Christian era.

### MODERN

- Browning, Andrew (ed.), *English Historical Documents, v. viii, 1660-1714*. Oxford. pp. 998. \$17.50.  
 Breton, H. L., *Stresmann and the Revision of Versailles*. Stanford. pp. 211. \$3.00.  
 Churchill, S. L. S., *Triumph and Tragedy*. Houghton. pp. 816. \$6.00.  
 Clay, C. T., *Long Live the Queen, George VI to Elizabeth II*. Winston. pp. 413. \$4.00.  
 Cohen, E. A., *Human Behavior in the Concentration Camp*. Norton. pp. 311. \$5.00.

- DePauw, C. A., *Educational Rights of the Church and Elementary Schools in Belgium*. Catholic University. pp. 162. An excellent study of the educational policy of Belgium prepared as a doctoral dissertation in the Canon Law Series of Catholic University by a native of Belgium.
- Gurion, David Ben, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 539. \$10.00.
- Gipson, L. H., *The Great War for Empire*. Knopf. pp. 394. \$7.50.
- Gooch, G. P., *Catherine the Great and Other Studies*. Longmans. pp. 312. \$5.00.
- Hilger, G., and A. G. Meyer, *The Incompatible Allies*. Macmillan. pp. 363. \$5.00.
- Hunt, R. D., *California in the Making*. Caxton. pp. 339. \$6.00.
- Kousoulas, D. G., *The Price of Freedom*. Syracuse Univ. pp. 221. \$4.00.
- Levi, W., *Modern China's Foreign Policy*. Univ. of Minn. pp. 339. \$5.50.
- Lipsky, G. A. (ed.), *Law and Politics in the World Community*. Univ. of Calif. pp. 393. \$6.00.
- Ludwig, E., *Napoleon*. Pocket Bks. pp. 656. \$0.50.
- Macaulay, T. B., *History of England*. Dutton. 4v. \$1.65 ea.
- Plamenatz, John, *German Marxism and Russian Communism*. Longmans. pp. 350. \$5.00.
- Polson, C. J., et al., *The Disposal of the Dead*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 312. \$7.50.
- Richmond, H., *The Navy as an Instrument of Policy, 1558-1727*. Cambridge Univ. pp. 404. \$12.00.
- Ross, J. B., and M. M. McLaughlin, (ed.), *The Portable Renaissance Reader*. Viking. pp. 768. \$2.50.
- Sedillot, R., *The History of the World in Two Hundred and Forty Pages*. New Amer. Lib. pp. 254. pap. \$0.35.
- Shaw, E. P., *The Case of Abbe Muncrief*. Bookman Associates. pp. 55. \$2.50.
- Singh, K., *The Sikhs*. Macmillan. pp. 215. \$3.75.
- Summerson, J. N., *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830*. Penguin Bks. pp. 390. \$8.50.
- Thompson, F., *A Short History of Parliament, 1295-1642*. Univ. of Minn. pp. 290. \$4.50.
- Wallis, L., *Young People's Hebrew History*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 126. \$2.50.
- Walsh, W. T. *Philip II*. McMullen. pp. 183. \$7.00.  
A reprint of a famous biography.
- Wheeler-Bennett, J. W., *The Nemesis of Power*. St. Martin's Press. pp. 845. \$12.00.

## AMERICAN

- Abbott, Sister M. M., *A City Parish Grows and Changes*. Catholic Univ. pp. 94. \$3.00.
- Anderson, F. M. B., *Leaven for the Frontier*. Christopher. pp. 437. \$4.75.
- Barnes, J. A., *Wealth of the American People*. Prentice Hall. pp. 920. \$6.00. A reprint of the 1949 edition of this one-volume economic history of the United States.
- Berton, F., *A Voyage on the Colorado, 1878*. Glen Dawson. pp. 103. \$5.00.

- Berthoff, R. T., *British Immigrants in Industrial America, 1790-1950*. Harvard. pp. 305. \$5.00.
- Botkin, B. A., and A. F. Harlow, *A Treasury of Railroad Folklore*. Crown. pp. 544. \$4.00.
- Brauer, J. C., *Protestantism in America*. Westminster Press. pp. 307. \$3.50.
- Caroe, Sir Olaf K., *Soviet Empire*. St. Martin's Press. pp. 310. \$5.00.
- Catton, B., *A Stillness at Appomattox*. Doubleday. pp. 446. \$5.00.
- Chapters in Western Civilizations, v. ii*, 2d ed. Columbia Univ. pp. 516. \$4.00.
- Clarita, Sister, *Leaders of Freedom*. Benziger. pp. 286. \$2.60.
- Cozens, F. W., and F. S. Stumpf, *Sports in American Life*. Univ. of Chicago. pp. 375. \$5.00.
- Cunningham, J. T., *This is New Jersey*. Rutgers Univ. pp. 240. \$5.00.
- Donald, D., *Inside Lincoln's Cabinet*. Longmans. pp. 350. \$6.00.
- Donohue, Sister J. M., *The Irish Catholic Benevolent Union*. Catholic Univ. pp. 228.
- Farquhar, F. P., *The Books of the Colorado River and the Grand Canyon*. Glen Dawson. pp. 84. \$5.00.
- Gerson, L. L., *Woodrow Wilson and the Rebirth of Poland, 1914-1920*. Yale. pp. 177. \$4.00.
- Greene, E. B., and R. B. Morris, *A Guide to the Principal Sources for Early American History (1600-1800)* in the City of New York. 2d. ed. rev. Columbia Univ. pp. 436. \$10.00.
- Hacker, L. M., and B. B. Kendrick, *The United States Since 1865*. Appleton. pp. 751. \$5.00. The fourth revised edition of this text book which first appeared during the depression (1932). Materials have been reworked and the views on the post Civil War barons of industry somewhat modified.
- Harris, J. P., *The Advice and Consent of the Senate*. Univ. of Calif. pp. 469. \$5.00.
- Kraus, M., *The Writing of American History*. Univ. of Okla. pp. 397. \$5.50.
- Lambert, J. R., *Arthur Pue Gorman*. La. State Univ. pp. 406. \$6.00.
- LaFollette, B. C., F. LaFollette, *Robert M. LaFollette*. Macmillan. 2v. \$15.00.
- Lizaso, F., *Marti, Martyr of Cuban Independence*. Univ. of N. M. pp. 267. \$4.00.
- Manning, C. A., *Russian Influence on Early America*. Library Pub. pp. 223. \$3.75.
- Marshall, G. N., *The Church of the Pilgrim Fathers*. Beacon. pp. 163.
- Mashbir, S. F., *I Was an American Spy*. Vantage. pp. 384. \$3.75.
- Murrett, J. C., *The Story of Father Price*. McMullen. pp. 116. \$1.50.
- Pierce, H. H., *Railroads of New York*. Harvard. pp. 222. \$3.00.
- Revill, J. C., *World History*. Longmans. pp. 774. \$5.25.
- Roscoe, Theodore, *United States Destroyer Operations in World War II*. U. S. Naval Inst. pp. 599. \$10.00.
- Roseboom, E. H., and F. P. Weisenburger, *A History of Ohio*. Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society. pp. 425. \$6.50.
- Ruppenthal, R. G., *Logistical Support of the Armies, v. 1*. Gov. Pr. Office. pp. 634. \$4.50.



- Schurz, W. L., *This New World*. Dutton. \$6.00.
- Spiller, R. E. et al., *Literary History of the United States*. Macmillan. pp. 1478. \$6.75.
- Stewart, G. R., *The Opening of the California Trail*. Univ. of Calif. pp. 123. \$3.75.
- Street, J. H., *The Civil War*. Dial. pp. 144. \$3.00.
- Studies of Historical Documents in the Library of the American Philosophical Society*. Amer. Phil. Soc. pp. 174. \$1.00.
- Tebbel, G., *George Washington's America*. Dutton. \$5.00.
- Theresine, Sister, *Challenge of Freedom*. Benziger. pp. 318. \$2.96.
- Wallace, E. S., *General William Jenkins Worth, Monterey's Forgotten Hero*. Southern Methodist Univ. pp. 250. \$5.00.
- Wallace, W. S., *Antoine Robidoux*. Glen Dawson. pp. 59. \$5.00.
- Wheeler, Sir Robert, *The Indus Civilization*. Cambridge Univ. pp. 133. \$3.75.
- Williamson, J. A., *The Tudor Age*. Longmans. pp. 471. \$5.00.
- Wilson, H. F., *The Jersey Shore*. Lewis Historical Soc. 3v. \$30.00.
- Wiley, B. I., *Southern Negroes, 1861-1865*. Rinehart. pp. 376. \$5.00.
- Wilson, S., *Louisiana Purchase*. Louisiana Landmarks Soc. pp. 96. \$5.00.
- Withington, A., *The Golden Cloak*. Honolulu Star-Bulletin. pp. 328. \$6.00.
- Wolle, M. V. S., *The Bonanza Trail*. Indiana Univ. Press. pp. 526. \$8.50.
- Van Deusen, G. G., *Horace Greeley, Nineteenth-Century Crusader*. Univ. of Pa. pp. 445. \$5.00.

## *What happened to the Liberals?*

A century ago, liberals, championing struggling middle and lower classes, denounced as "meddlesome influences" with individual rights social legislation that would be described "humanitarian" today. By 1914, they had abandoned their laissez-faire attitude, adopting a welfare state philosophy. Why?

*For the answer, read . . .*

## **THE RISE AND DECLINE OF LIBERALISM**

**Thomas P. Neill**

Author of *Makers of the Modern Mind*

"... the opening sentence . . . quotes Max Lerner's observation that Liberalism is 'perhaps the most disputed term of our generation.' The very making of this statement argues the necessity for this book . . . a substantial contribution to the literature on Liberalism." — *Commonweal* **\$5.50**

AT YOUR BOOKSTORE

**THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY**

2803 Bruce Bldg.  
Milwaukee 1, Wis.

# SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

*A Jesuit Institution*

*Founded 1818*



"Democracy is built upon the  
bedrock of Christian education..."

## CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

Labor College  
School of Law  
Graduate School  
School of Divinity  
School of Nursing  
School of Dentistry  
School of Medicine  
Institute of Technology  
School of Social Service  
Institute of Social Science  
College of Arts and Sciences  
College of Philosophy and Letters  
School of Commerce and Finance  
Parks College of Aeronautical Technology

## CORPORATE COLLEGES

Webster College  
Maryville College  
Fontbonne College  
St. Mary's Junior College  
Notre Dame Junior College

*Saint Louis University owns and operates*

**Radio Station WEW**

**Saint Louis 3**

**Missouri**